


LD 171


A52

A3

Copy 2



D 171
A52 A3
Copy 2



REJOINDER

TO

I. W. Allen's Pseudo "History"

OF

ANTIOCH COLLEGE.

[Eli Jay]



YELLOW SPRINGS, O.
LONGLEY BROTHERS, PRINTERS:
CINCINNATI.
1859.

No. 2

58284572

LD 171
A 52 A 3
copy 2

Small about 1000 10-3

Small about 1000 10-3

INTRODUCTION.

THOSE who have read Mr. I. W. ALLEN'S book, which claims to be a truthful "History" of Antioch College, have been looking for a reply to it or a denial of it, in some form. They have said, "If Mr. Allen's charges are not true, why do not the friends of the College refute them?" To this question there are at least four reasons, viz :

1. It was at once seen to be impossible to reply to *all* of Mr. Allen's false statements and colorings and cruel insinuations, without making a volume too large to secure a general perusal, and there was no one acquainted with the facts in the case, who had leisure to devote to their compilation. Our circumstances, in this respect, are widely different from those of the writer of the book. He devoted his entire time and energies, for more than a year and a quarter, to the compilation of his work and other collateral labors, having no other business, using notes which he seems to have been taking for four years before with the same sinister design, fabricating falsehoods where it was necessary to his purpose, and, in other cases, warping the truth, or putting it in false settings; while, on the other hand, the Faculty of the College have, for the last two years, been greatly engrossed with the load of duties which have devolved upon

them, and I have devoted all my time to its redemption ; so there was no one who knew the facts in their chronological order, and in their relations to each other, who had an hour to spare.

2. There are hundreds in all sections of the country who know that Mr. Allen's course is grossly inconsistent. He had been through Ohio, New-York and New-England, representing himself as an abused and insulted man, because he was not re-appointed to his Chair. He labored with me personally, as a member of the committee appointed to employ a Faculty, to secure his re-appointment, after he knew that Mr. Mann was to be its head; and the readers of the Gospel Herald will distinctly remember that he and his friends were very indignant, because the committee refused to re-appoint him. Yet he represents Mr. Mann as the unprincipled, and ever successful manager of all the College affairs, a man who stops not a moment at falsehood and perfidy, when his own purposes are to be served. He says virtually, and in almost so many words, that Mr. Mann was so completely wanting in veracity and common honesty, that the characters of the Professors were constantly in danger, and that those who did not bow to his behests were liable to be removed on the simplest pretext and on the shortest notice. Indeed, the book abounds not only with low insinuations, intended to disparage Mr. Mann, but also with the boldest and strongest accusations against him. He also represents that the whole Faculty, except himself and Mr. Doherty, and almost the whole Board of Trustees, went over to Mr. Mann's interests, and became his tools.

Now the friends of the College have supposed that the intelligent reader would put *that* and *that* together, and ask the very pertinent question, which Mr. Allen's book

suggests, but which it entirely fails to answer, viz : If Mr. Mann is such a knave and villain as he represents him to be, and if the Faculty and the Board of Trustees were so completely under his control, that the grossest injustice was often done to himself, as he says, why did he mourn and complain and threaten, because he was not allowed to remain in the Faculty, and be abused and insulted as before? Mr. Mann had not changed. Allen knew that most of the former Faculty would be retained. Why, then, did he desire to continue in a position in which he had long been abused, and to co-operate with men who had repeatedly insulted him? Why did he not rather hold a jubilee, that the disbanding of the Faculty, by a vote of the Trustees, enabled him to escape from the clutches of those who had long been pursuing him? His book, and his complaints, a year ago, would not look well side by side. Mr. Allen gave me to understand very distinctly, that he had the power to injure the College immensely, and that he should, most certainly, use it if he were not re-appointed to his chair. And one of Mr. Allen's most intimate and most active friends, A. L. McKinney, has expressed the opinion, that if he had been re-appointed, his book would never have been written.

3. By a committee of three prominent ministers of the Christian denomination, J. G. Reeder, O. J. Wait, and T. M. McWhinney, men widely and favorably known for their candor and impartiality, who came to the College to examine into the causes of Mr. Allen's non-appointment, that they might defend the appointing power against his cruel charges, or expose their treachery to the Christians, he had been published to the world as guilty of falsehood, a deceiver, an unsafe companion in labor ;

so odious to those who knew him best, that four of the old Faculty chose to leave the College rather than to associate with him longer. The honor, the integrity of the gentlemen composing that committee, had never been doubted. They did not come to the College as friends of *mine*, but rather inclined, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, to believe that I had dealt unfairly by Mr. Allen. But such was the nature of the testimony adduced, that they were obliged to report as they did. As their report was published, the friends of the College have supposed that the statements of such a man as they represented Mr. Allen to be, would be read with great allowance.

4. The book is pervaded by such a malignant and vindictive spirit, and its pretended disclosures seem to exhibit so fully the motives of the author, that many have been entirely willing to let both pass, without the least notice. The whole plot is preposterous. The book does not even purport to be an account of a disagreement between parties, nearly equal in number; but it does pretend to make the incredible revelation, that the author, a young man, of whom the world has heard but very little, who had never exhibited any special sagacity or remarkable insight into character, had discovered that a host of men, some of whom will be remembered for their noble deeds and sterling virtues long after Mr. Allen is forgotten, and many of whom have long been, and are still leading ministers of the Christian denomination, and yet enjoying the confidence of the community—these men, I say, this young man has discovered to be so completely destitute of all moral principle, so wanting in all the elements of genuine character, that they merit the scorn and contempt of all right minded people; yet

that he preserved his immaculateness in the midst of a sea of corruption, which swallowed many older and more experienced men. Hon. Horace Mann, Rev. Drs. Bellows, and Craig, Elders Amasa Stanton, Moses Cummings, J. H. Currier, J. Maple, J. G. Reeder, T. M. McWhinney, O. J. Wait, J. B. Weston, John Phillips, Eli Fay, Dr Warriner, Profs. Cary and Fessenden, Mrs. Dean, Miss Wilmarth, almost the entire Board of Trustees, and all others who stood in his way, are spoken of in most slanderous terms. Mr. Allen alone, has made the remarkable discovery that they are impostors and hypocrites.

This, in itself, is so preposterous as to be enough to destroy the credit of any man, making such a pretence. So the Editor of the Herald of Gospel Liberty viewed it, and so expressed himself in his notice of the book. So many persons of candor and intelligence have expressed themselves on taking up the book, and receiving from it their first impressions of the case.

We might here, perhaps, safely rest our cause; for when personal feelings shall die away, the young man who has insolence enough ruthlessly to assail the moral character of those who were renowned for integrity and benevolence before he was born, or to attack those who raised him from that obscurity in which his enmity would have been harmless, to a position which alone gives power to his malice, will be looked upon with universal abhorrence.

Still the friends of the College, and those whom Mr. Allen has attacked, have thought it best that I should make a brief reply, for the following reasons :

I. He has taken great pains to circulate his book, where our paper containing the reports of the committee

in his case, and where those whom he attacked are not known.

II. The grossest assaults on character will be believed by some, until disproved.

III. The abundant evidence now at hand, to prove the book a tissue of misrepresentation and falsehood, would soon be scattered by removals and death, when it would be much more harmful than it is now.

It is not proposed, however, to reply to the book as a whole, but simply to expose its leading designs, and answer its principal accusations, and thus to show that, as a "History," it is entirely unreliable.

With these remarks, I proceed to employ a few hours before I must leave for New-York to prosecute my work in behalf of the College, in preparing to submit to the public a few facts and considerations, and leave the reader to judge whether Mr. Allen's statements are really facts or fiction.

ELI FAY.

MR. FAY'S STATEMENT.

ALLEN'S TITLE PAGE IS FALSE.

Mr. Ira W. Allen's so called "History of Antioch College," opens characteristically. It has two falsehoods upon its title page:

First, It assumes to be a "History of the Rise, Difficulties, and *Suspension* of Antioch College," when every body knows, who knows anything about it, that Antioch College has never had a suspension. From its opening in October, 1853, till now, it has been in constant operation, except during its ordinary vacations. Its property was assigned in 1857, but it never was suspended. We do not see why he should make so bare a falsehood so conspicuous, unless it is that here, as elsewhere in his book, he has mistaken himself for Antioch College.

Secondly, He calls his book "A Record of *Facts!*" How he could get more falsehood into so few words, it is impossible to conceive.

One would expect in such a work, something of a detail of the circumstances of the inception and early history of the Institution; but, so far from this, two pages suffice for him to tell his whole story of the early measures in behalf of the College, its erection, the organization of its Faculty, &c., up to 1853, "when," he says,

“*I sailed for Europe,*” and a half a page more to bring it down to September, 1854, when “*I arrived in New-York, direct from Europe.*” And this is but a specimen of the egotism of the whole work. But its egotism is a light fault in comparison with its gross and slanderous falsity.

ALLEN FABRICATES A REPORT OF A CONVERSATION
WITH MR. FAY.

On the 7th page of his College History, he says: “Early in September, 1854, I arrived in New-York; direct from Europe, and calling on Elder Eli Fay, he took occasion to give me a brief history of the College during my absence, and I was greatly surprised to learn that troubles had already arisen. He reflected on Mr. Mann as the cause of them, represented him as opposed to prayer-meetings in the College, and Prof. Holmes as a firm advocate of them.”

Now, I pronounce this paragraph an entire fabrication, so far as it pretends to be a report of any conversation which ever occurred between us. I never told Mr. Allen anything of the sort. Again, if I had made any such disclosures to Mr. Allen, would it not have been perfectly natural to allude to them in our subsequent correspondence? Would not those expressions of surprise, found in my letters quoted by Mr. Allen—letters written in answer to his own—have been entirely unnatural? The first extract from my letters which Mr. Allen has published, shows that *he commenced the correspondence*, and every one shows very clearly, that instead of being familiar with the subject of Mr. Allen's letters, they took me completely by surprise. The extracts themselves are

evidence that I wrote under excitement which Mr. Allen's letters had produced.

HE EARLY COMMENCES HIS SECRET ATTACKS ON
MR. MANN.

The facts concerning this correspondence are as follows: Mr. Allen commenced writing to me in the winter or very early in the spring of 1855. I think I received about a dozen letters from him. They abounded with most alarming accusations against Mr. Mann, and some other members of the Faculty, and also against some of the students. Mr. Mann was accused of a conspiracy against Mr. Allen and the Christians in and out of the College, of showing the greatest partiality among the teachers and students, and of a general mal-administration of all the College affairs. I have never had so little interest in the College, as to be unmoved by such charges. I was greatly excited by Mr. Allen's letters, and replied to them in a spirited manner, and with that perfect frankness which I have tried to practice towards all men. I had the utmost confidence in Mr. Allen at that time and supposed that he was telling me the truth, and that he would be willing to stand up to his statements like a man, and help to right the wrongs of which he complained. I advised him to go to Mr. Mann with his complaints. In the very first letter of mine, which he quotes, I said to him, "Don't fear to tell Mr. Mann plainly just what you think of the whole affair, and that partiality shown to some teachers, and disrespect shown others, will result in an explosion, as it certainly will if it is not stopped. Now, sir, I desire to write to Mr. Mann myself" concerning these general charges.

HE DARES NOT MAKE THEM OPENLY.

But Mr. Allen replied immediately, saying, that he could accomplish nothing by meeting Mr. Mann, that Mr. Mann was a very adroit manager, and that he (Allen) would labor under great disadvantages, in demanding explanations, or seeking reconciliation. He also urged me to say nothing, whatever, to Mr. Mann of the nature of his charges, as it would at once endanger his position in the College. Still I urged upon him the necessity of meeting Mr. Mann face to face. I told him if he wished to effect a reconciliation through me, I must be allowed to present his charges against him (Mann) to Mr. Mann himself. But the manner in which he received my suggestions and advice, and, indeed, the nature of our previous correspondence touching this whole subject, and a determination already forming on my part to compel him to meet Mr. Mann, may all be inferred from another quotation which he makes from another of my letters, dated about two and a half months after the first. Mr. Allen quotes me as saying to him, "I cannot see why you should be afraid to meet Mr. Mann face to face, in defence of the right. Certainly I cannot act as mediator, if I must withhold all the facts. How can parties ever be reconciled while they seek concealment with smouldering fires in their bosoms? My only hope of a satisfactory adjudication is in the plainest and strongest statement of the facts in the case."

This is certainly a most unfortunate paragraph for Mr. Allen. Several most important facts of our previous correspondence are here unmistakably referred to: 1st, It appears very clearly that I had been urging Mr. Allen "to meet Mr. Mann face to face." 2d, It is equally as

evident that Mr. Allen had refused. 3d, It also appears that I had expressed a desire to acquaint Mr. Mann with what Mr. Allen had presented to me as "facts." 4th, It is further evident that Mr. Allen had charged me to "withhold all the facts." 5th, That I desired to bring things to light, as a means of reconciling parties; and 6th, That he was seeking "concealment with smouldering fires in his bosom." Without the least warping, these "facts" stand out in my words, which Mr. Allen himself has quoted, and they very truly represent the entire character of our correspondence on that subject.

I continued urging him to meet Mr. Mann, or to allow me to acquaint him with Mr. Allen's grievances, and he continued to refuse, until, finally, my suspicions were excited, and I told him plainly that unless his refusals were withdrawn, I wished to hear no more of his complaints.

HE BECOMES ALARMED AND RECALLS HIS LETTERS.

In a very short time after, Mrs. Fay received a letter from him, while I was absent from home, in which he requested that *all his letters to me should be returned immediately*. His request was complied with at once. His letters were returned, but he has never returned mine. And, now, having put it out of my power to defend myself by quotations from his letters, he publishes extracts from mine, without the least allusion to his own, to which mine were simply replies. It is certainly a little surprising, that a man who has done such a deed, can introduce himself to the public as an example of purity and piety, and boast, not very modestly, of his numerous Christian virtues. As Mr. Allen has intimated that he

will publish other extracts from my letters, unless I conduct myself to please him, I hereby challenge him to produce my letters and his own, side by side. But the reader may be assured that his will never be seen by the public. He would never have recalled them in hot haste, if he had not understood that by them he could be convicted of treachery and falsehood.

The following statement by Mr. Mann, corroborates what I have said of my correspondence with Mr. Allen, and, also, shows how he then conducted himself towards those whom he was bitterly accusing :

“In the spring of 1855 rumors reached me that Mr. Fay, of New-York, was ill at ease respecting the administration of the College. Thereupon I wrote him a private and friendly letter, asking him for the *what* and the *why*. He replied in a letter of eleven large letter paper pages, containing a body of accusations, heavy enough to sink a ship. Each and every one of these was so utterly and maliciously false, so far outside of the possibility of being true, that I stood aghast on reading them. I looked about to see who could have been their inventor, for Mr. Fay had given me no name, nor clew to any. I could hardly allow my suspicions to fall upon any one. Not one of my colleagues had ever breathed to me a word of dissatisfaction. Mr. Allen I met every day, often several times a day ; he visited at my house ; he had revealed no sign of disaffection on personal or administrative account. As, however, I could not help thinking that he must know something about Mr. Fay’s informants, I called on him in a friendly way. His manner was mealy-mouthed and deprecatory. He affirmed that he had never written but two or three letters to Mr. Fay on College affairs, and

said he would be willing to let me see them all. The conversation closed with a promise on his part, that he would never repeat such an act, but that if, in future, he should have any exception to take, respecting me, he would speak of it, first of all, to me in private.

HORACE MANN."

Two other facts in connection with this correspondence merit attention: 1st, Mr. Mann learned that I had heard many reports prejudicial to the College, and at once wrote me, inquiring what they were, and who were his accusers. My chief regret, so far as I had anything to do with that affair, has been, and must ever be, that I gave to Mr. Mann the charges, without giving my authority, and that what was thus intended as a kindness to Mr. Allen, he has converted into an instrument of torture to Mr. Mann and the College. Had I given my authority before Mr. Allen demanded his letters, Mr. Mann would undoubtedly have demanded an examination, and Mr. Allen would have been exposed. 2d, Mr. Allen quotes me as saying that his statements to me had been "corroborated by others." Well, I supposed that I was telling the truth; but it turns out that what I supposed to be the testimony of two or three persons, was simply the testimony of Mr. Allen himself. Prof. J. B. Weston is one of the persons to whom I referred as corroborating Mr. Allen's statements. The following letter from him, not only explains itself, but also throws light on the course which Mr. Allen was wont to pursue as a member of the Faculty. Mr. Weston says:

"In the spring of 1855, Mr. I. W. Allen was a Professor, and I was a student in Antioch College. One

circumstance occurred, which he so explained at the time as to lead me to believe that Mr. Mann and another member of the Faculty, had done injustice to me. At his instigation, I wrote to Mr. Fay, criticising them, and asking for explanations. I soon learned, however, to my entire satisfaction, that they were innocent of the charges made by him, and my suspicions, which were thereby excited, were entirely removed, and I immediately wrote to Mr. Fay to that effect. J. B. WESTON."

Here Mr. Allen appeared in his true character, as a jealous, intriguing, ambitious, mischief-making man, as he proved himself to be during his connection with the College, going among the students and neighbors, writing to persons at a distance, and throwing out his insinuations and accusations against his coadjutors, and that, too, while he seemed to be on most intimate terms with them.

Prof. Holmes was the other person who corroborated Mr. Allen's statements. The circumstances of this case will appear in another part of this book. Suffice it to say here, that Mr. Allen himself instigated Mr. Holmes's withdrawal, and then charged all the blame upon Mr. Mann, and represented to Mr. Holmes that Mr. Mann, and not himself, was the cause of it; so, it is not wonderful, that for a time Prof. Holmes felt that Mr. Mann had done him a great wrong. But none are more satisfied now, than Mr. Holmes himself, of the false part acted by Mr. Allen at that time. He has recently said, and said truly, in allusion to the troubles which have arisen, not only in the College, but also in the Church in Yellow Springs, and in regard to the Gospel Herald, "Allen seems to me to be the cause of all these troubles,

and I think he has been from the time of the first movement against me."

Thus, what I regarded at the time as a corroboration of Mr. Allen's statement was simply an expression of his own opinions by others into whose minds he had, by misrepresentation and intrigue, instilled them, and neither of whom has now the least confidence in him.

Before dismissing the subject of our correspondence it is proper to state that Mr. Allen's letters were often very voluminous, filling from three to five sheets of common note paper; and, so far as my memory serves me, the College and its affairs were our only topic. It should also be stated that the reports of the dissatisfaction of the other teachers came to me from Mr. Allen, and I have every reason to believe that *that* too was created by himself alone.

WHY MR. ALLEN WAS NOT RE-APPOINTED.

I will now call attention to the reasons why Mr. Allen was left out of the new Faculty, and also to the course which he subsequently pursued, and what followed.

At the annual meeting of the trustees of the College held in the last of June, 1857, all the College property was assigned to F. A. Palmer, Esqr., for the benefit of its creditors, and the Faculty was disbanded. Subsequently, it was decided to continue the educational department of the College, and a committee, consisting of Rev. Dr. Bellows, Hon. A. Harlan and myself, was appointed to employ a new Faculty. The committee did not see fit to re-appoint Mr. Allen, because *those who knew him well* and without whom it was impossible to organize the new Faculty, *would no longer co-operate with him.* His conduct as a member of the Faculty had been such

that they refused to be associated with him any longer. I called on Professors Cary and Warriner, who had been eminently successful in their respective departments, and were universally esteemed as Christian gentlemen, to learn if they would continue in their Chairs, and the following is the decision which they gave me at the time, and which at my request they have furnished to me:—

“ At the end of the Collegiate year, 1856-7, having become convinced of the untrustworthiness of Ira W. Allen, we declined serving any longer upon the College Faculty if he were re-appointed. We felt unwilling to co-operate with a man who had proved faithless to his associates, and who stood in a continual attitude of hostility to the President.”

GEO. L. CARY,

H. A. WARRINER.”

“ *Yellow Springs, May 23rd, 1859.*”

Mr. Mann and Mrs. Dean likewise refused to work longer with him. They loved Antioch and were willing to work for it. But they had proved Mr. Allen to be so false, so malicious, and so dangerous withal, that they preferred to seek a new field of labor rather than to co-operate with him any longer. Professors Coburn and Waterhouse, who were members of the Faculty during the year previous to the assignment, entertained precisely the same opinions of him. Indeed he was not respected in the least, by one of his co-laborers, except Mr. Doherty, if indeed that were an exception. He was, therefore, left out of the new Faculty.

Then, after repeated and earnest efforts, by entreaty and threat, to obtain a re-appointment, but without avail, he immediately commenced that determined opposition to the College which he had threatened in case of his

non-appointment, and manifested that malignity towards me which a true man never cherishes. He traveled very extensively through Ohio, New-York, and New-England, and wherever he went, the College was the object of attack, and I was accused of betraying the Christians. Indeed, he undertook to alienate the Christians from the College entirely. He tried to persuade Mr. Weston to break his promise to return to the College as Principal of the Preparatory Department. He did everything which he could to excite suspicion against myself, Mr. Mann and the College.

HIS FRIEND, MR. DOHERTY, WRITES EDITORIALS.

Mr. Doherty, who now defended Mr. Allen's cause as a part of his own, wrote an article under the caption, "Antioch College,—A Warning," and, by false representations, induced Elder James Maple to publish it as an Editorial, with slight alterations, in the *Gospel Herald* of August 13th, 1857.

It is painful to be obliged to say that that article abounds in falsehoods and misrepresentations. The College was most bitterly assailed, and I was represented as an "enemy to vital godliness and the Christian denomination."

On the 3rd of September following, another Editorial appeared in the *Gospel Herald*, headed "*Antioch College and its New Faculty—Total Exclusion of the Representatives of the Christian Church.*"

In this article I was most bitterly denounced. The act of leaving Messrs. Allen and Doherty out of the new Faculty was pronounced "*a wanton and high handed outrage, that must alienate and mortally offend every true*

and honest member of the Christian Church in every part of the country."

This Editorial was also written by Mr. Doherty.

These articles are printed in Mr. Allen's book [pages 79—82,] as written by Elder James Maple; and he frequently repeats the language they contain to damage both Mr. Maple and the College. So late as April 27, he caused to be republished in the *Gospel Herald* a portion of one of these articles, appending to it the name of James Maple. Both were written by Mr. Doherty. The phrase which he loves so much to quote, "*the little scheming, selfish, greedy clique,*"—is not the language of James Maple, but of *W. H. Doherty*. See it reproduced almost verbatim, in Mr. D's. letter to Mr. Maple respecting the affairs of the Second Church in this place. Mr. Doherty and Mr. Allen were constantly in each other's confidence, and Mr. Allen must have known that Mr. Doherty was the real author of those Editorials; did he not, then, every time he repeated them as the language of Elder Maple, repeat what he must know to be false?

[A GROSS INCONSISTENCY.]

This article, as well as their previous efforts to obtain a re-appointment, shows how anxious both he and Mr. Allen were to retain their places in the Faculty. How inconsistent with their course are the accusations it contains.

Was it "a wanton and a high-handed outrage which must mortally offend every true and honest member of the Christian Church in every part of the country," that two such pure and spotless men as they represent themselves to be, were left out of an Institution which they them-

selves say had then long been unworthy of public patronage? Was it an "outrage high-handed and wanton," to snatch two pious, worthy men from the heartless, godless set who had vexed their righteous souls for years? Such are their own representations.

Putting these things together, do they not place themselves before the world in one of the following attitudes? either as very anxious to remain in an Institution which they themselves knew at the time to be rotten to the very core, and entirely unworthy of confidence, without making any public exposure of it until they were likely to lose their places; or, as having made representations concerning it which were wilfully and maliciously false?

ORIGIN OF THE "SELF-CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE."

Under these circumstances what could I do? Ought I to sink quietly down under these terrible accusations, and tacitly admit that, in leaving Mr. Allen out of the Faculty I had shown myself "an enemy of vital godliness and the Christian denomination?" Should I acknowledge that I had committed "a wanton and a high-handed outrage?" I must submit to such charges, or disclose to the public the facts which impelled me to my course. Messrs. Allen and Doherty alone are responsible for that state of things which made this exposure necessary. Wherever they went they accused me in the strongest language they could command, until in self-defense alone I was obliged to speak. I was the party accused. I decided to write to a number of our brethren of large experience and undoubted interest in the Christian denomination, to meet at the College, and to present to them the reasons which induced the Com-

mittee to leave Messrs. Allen and Doherty out of their Chairs. I wanted men who were known to the whole denomination, and in whom all had confidence. I did not care particularly what their feelings were towards me or the College, if they were honest men; for I knew that there were facts enough to convince the strongest sceptic, if his mind was open to conviction. I invited five able and worthy brethren, J. G. Reeder, H. Simonton, O. J. Wait, T. M. McWhinney and Dr. Foster. Br. Simonton and Dr. Foster did not come. These brethren were *appointed* by no conference, no church. I did not *appoint* them. I *invited* them. They were, therefore, in every sense of the term, a "SELF-CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE."

And, now, who are this committee? Elder Reeder is a minister nearly sixty years of age. He has been one of the leading ministers of the Miami Conference for many years past, and has often served as chairman at its annual sessions. For strict integrity, honesty, impartiality and candor, he is as well known as any man in Southwestern Ohio. Ira W. Allen is his only accuser, so far as I have ever heard.

Elder O. J. Wait has been known to the New-England Christians for many years as a most successful pastor, an able writer, and a genuine Christian. He is now a resident of Ohio.

Elder T. M. McWhinney is as widely and as favorably known as any minister of his age in the denomination. It is sufficient to say of him that he has recently gathered a large congregation, and is now engaged in building a fine church in a neighborhood in which he has been known from boyhood. With these men life and fortune

might be safely trusted, yet Mr. Allen cannot find epithets mean enough to describe them.

I wished to take no advantage of Mr. Allen. I therefore invited him to be present when the committee should meet. But he knew that he could not face my witnesses. He knew that the turpitude of his conduct could neither be palliated nor explained away. He therefore desired to stand entirely aloof, and then create sympathy by crying that it was an *ex parte* affair. I presented evidence in justification of my course until Elder Reeder exclaimed, "It is enough : We can ask no more."

The committee then held a discussion as to whether they should report the facts which had been presented to them ; or, out of kindness to Mr. Allen, simply exonerate the committee from all blame for leaving him out of the Faculty. They decided on the latter course, and on the 12th of November, 1857, the following report appeared in the *Gospel Herald*, the paper through which I, as one of the committee to employ a Faculty, had been so bitterly assailed :

" COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

" Whereas, certain remarks have been made touching the action of the committee (Hon. A. Harlan, Rev. H. W. Bellows, D.D., and Elder E. Fay,) to which was referred the selection of the Faculty of Antioch College for the ensuing year ;

" And whereas, these remarks have, as we believe, been *very* prejudicial to the best interest of the College—in that they have led, at least some, and perhaps many, of the warm-hearted patrons of the College, not only to distrust the committee, but to lose confidence in most, if

not *all*, of those who have the supervision of the Institution; and this feeling of general distrust having grown out of the fact that this committee refused to re-appoint two of our brethren, Professors Doherty and Allen, men in whom we had *implicit* confidence;

“And whereas, the facts that influenced that committee in its action were to be had by any who sought them, and knowing that for us to believe rumor, when *truth* could be obtained, was not only to do injustice to ourselves and the committee, but the *grossest* wrong to the College;

“Therefore, we, the undersigned, formed ourselves into a committee, for the purpose, not only of satisfying ourselves as to the *surprising* action of that committee, but, furthermore, of presenting, if it were ever deemed proper, the result of our inquiry to others of our friends, that they, too, might know why that committee acted as they did.

“And now, permit us to say, that having gone to the College on Saturday, 17th day of this month, and having heard the testimony of the students, class by class, and moreover, having heard the testimony of the Faculty—we say, that, having gone to the only place where we supposed the *truth* could be elicited, and having gathered *all the facts* that we could, *it is our most deliberate and abiding conviction that that committee could not, in view of the evidence presented them, have appointed either of those two brethren to a Professorship in Antioch College.*

“Had they appointed them, we cannot but believe that their action would have been to gratify a *few* personal friends, rather than to have consulted the *general* interest of our beloved Institution.

“We have but to say in conclusion, that this committee is “self-constituted,” and this report gratuitous; hence we submit it, with the hope that, if you are still not satisfied with the action of that committee, you will, for the sake of our long cherished College, adopt some plan whereby your conclusion may hereafter be based upon facts rather than rumors.

T. M. McWHINNEY, }
 J. G. REEDER, } *Committee.”*
 O. J. WAIT. }

“*Franklin, Oct. 28th, 1857.*”

MR. ALLEN ATTACKS THE COMMITTEE, WHICH NECESSITATES A SECOND REPORT.

When this report appeared, Mr. Allen became furious. He assailed the committee with all the malice which he had before manifested towards myself and others. He complained of the report because of its indefiniteness, said that he would have greatly preferred the facts, “that the report was a cowardly attack upon him, a thrust in the dark, that it was impossible to defend himself against such blind insinuations,” and so forth, till the committee who, to my personal knowledge, intended to screen him from merited scorn by the generality of their first report, were driven in self-defence, to publish a second report presenting the facts in the case. Not having their second report at hand I present the following extracts from it, as they appeared in different parts of Mr. Allen's book.*

*QUERY,—Why did not Mr. Allen in his review of the Second Report, give it entire, and in one body? Did he not dare to trust his readers with such an array of authenticated specifications against him? Did he fear to trust his reputation with more than one in a place?

The committee say,

“ Without *specifying any* of the facts proven, we gave it as our deliberate and abiding conviction, that the committee could not, in view of the evidence presented to them, have appointed either of those two men to a Professorship in the College.

“ The reason why we made a *generic* rather than a *specific* report, was to screen the “ illogical moral character ” of Mr. Allen. And we would not *now* be willing to make a disclosure of the *facts*, were it not for the reason that we have learned, personally and otherwise, that Mr. Allen is taking advantage of that want of *specificness* to the great injury of the cause of truth, and the Christian character of those who made that report; and hence the *mercy* that we showed him has been turned against us; and thus the innocent have been made to suffer for the wickedness of the guilty.

“ Now, however much we may have desired to cover Mr. Allen’s ‘ multitude of sins,’ we now feel, in view of the course he is taking, that it is our duty—a duty that we owe to ourselves, to the world, and to God, to state in plain Anglo-Saxon terms the reasons why the committee did not re-appoint Mr. Allen to a Professorship in the College.

“ But to the facts: Having formed ourselves into a committee, and met in the College, on Saturday the 17th day of October last, in the presence of the Faculty and others, it was proven to us—

“ 1st. That Mr. Allen, though very friendly to Mr. Mann’s face, and often visiting him and sharing his hospitalities and the pleasures of his social parties, had for a long time secretly used his utmost influence to create a prejudice against Mr. Mann, and that, too, where

such prejudice would prove most fatal to Mr. Mann's usefulness as President of the College."

"2nd. That when Mr. Allen had brought an accusation against one of the subordinate teachers, and failed to sustain it, he then *positively* falsified the record to screen himself. This was when Mr. Allen was acting as Secretary of the Faculty."

"3d. It was proved to us that in the Faculty meetings he would cast his vote in a given way, and then go to the students, and preparingly to keeping on friendly terms with them, would insinuate that he voted differently; and in some instances positively denying his vote."

"4th. It was proven to us that Mr. Allen did tell several positive falsehoods to Mr. Fessenden concerning Mr. Mann; and when Mr. Fessenden, as his only means of self-defence, told Mr. Mann what Mr. Allen had told him, he was severely censured by Mr. Allen. Mr. Allen said to Mr. Fessenden, 'You ought to have denied to Mr. Mann you ever heard me say anything about it, for it was not designed for other men's ears.' Mr. Fessenden inquired: 'Do I understand you, Mr. Allen, to say that I should have denied the facts.' Mr. Allen replied: 'It is morally right for you to say to Mr. Mann that you did not know, and that I never told you.' This *enormous* charge was sustained by the testimony of Professors Fessenden and J. B. Weston. Who in the Christian denomination will think any the less of Antioch because she *spears* [spurns] such men from her halls?"

"5th. It was proved to us that Mr. Allen himself instigated the removal of Professor Holmes, and afterwards tried to convince Holmes, and others, that it was an insult to him and a great indignity to the Christian Church."

“6th. It was proven to us, from his own letters, that Mr. Allen had circulated false reports touching the general administration of the College.”

I doubt very much whether these are all the important parts of that report. But certainly a man of ordinary moral sensibility would stagger under *them*. Mr. Allen attempts to reply to these reports, by assailing the characters of these gentlemen of the committee. But he has only injured himself. He certainly cannot harm them. Then he abuses me for calling a committee; says I used dishonorable means to get a committee, &c., for the complete refutation of which charge I will refer the reader to Elder Hiram Simonton's statement. Then he accuses others, as though it would greatly help him if he could prove that somebody else was a knave. But after all his explanations and accusations of others, there the report stands, and there it will forever stand, as the deliberate expression of three intelligent, candid and influential Christian ministers, touching the character of I. W. Allen.

Now I shall not attempt to vindicate the characters of those brethren, nor their ability to weigh testimony. I shall take for granted, what those who know them never doubted, that they knew their duties as committee men, that they understood the nature of the testimony presented to them, the character of their report, their responsibility to Mr. Allen, and his means of redress if they charged him falsely. Therefore, Mr. Allen must carry the brand of falsehood and perfidy, placed on him by a committee of Christian ministers.

This committee was very much pained by the necessity of making such a report. They tried to avoid that

necessity. They offered Mr. Allen a rehearing. I heard them say again and again, that, considering the age of the young man and their former respect for him, they would greatly rejoice if their decision could be reversed by a new jury. He was assured, personally and by letter, that I was ready to go into an examination of the whole matter with him. But he has uniformly spurned all propositions of that sort.

HE CAN HAVE ANOTHER COMMITTEE IF HE WILL.

He dares not meet me before any impartial tribunal. But, to show my perfect willingness to receive whatever light Mr. Allen has to throw upon the subject, I hereby make another proposition. *At a time and before a committee which shall be agreed upon by us, I will, in the town of Yellow Springs, go into an examination of the causes which induced us to leave him out of the Faculty. If said committee will decide that we did wrong, I will pay the entire expenses of the trial myself, and make such a retraction as they may require, through all our denominational papers. But if they should decide that he was morally unfit to be a member of the Faculty, he shall pay the expenses and endorse their verdict.*

The charges of infidelity, of endeavoring, by tricks and fraud to force myself upon an unwilling people; of dividing the Church, of attacking the Bible, of scattering the congregation, and indeed his entire Church history of nearly 70 pages, in which my name is used about one hundred times, are most triumphantly refuted by the committee appointed by the Miami Conference to examine into the troubles in the Church here. We refer the reader to that report.

THE FALSEHOOD RESPECTING MR. DEAN'S COLLEGE
AGENCY, AND MR. FAY'S INTEREST IN IT.

On the 62nd page of his College History, he says, "Indeed it was said that Mr. Dean received 16 per cent on all the moneys which passed through his hands, and that Eli Fay had been chiefly instrumental in appointing Mr. Dean Agent, and giving him a written contract for the Eastern territory at the 16 per cent. What share of the profits Mr. Fay was to have we do not know."

Let the reader notice the cowardly phraseology and the dishonorable insinuations of this paragraph. "It is said," is offered for historical authority, "we do not know," as an historical fact. The fact is an important one. I am glad he acknowledges that he "did not know" that I received any of the profits; I am certainly very thankful for this exceptional favor, though it is small. If instead of insinuating in the form of a negation, that I did "receive a share of the profits," he had asserted that three fourths of it went directly into my pockets, it would have been very much like some of his other statements concerning me.

The facts are as follows. I had a written contract with Mr. Dean, for the Eastern territory. By the terms of that contract Mr. D. was to receive but three per cent, on a very large portion of the money that passed through his hands; on another portion 8 per cent, and on still another portion, which it was supposed would be small and difficult to obtain, 16 per cent; and *Mr. Allen knew these facts* when he wrote that paragraph; for in collecting statistics for his History, he spent hours over the clerk's book of records, in which my contract with Mr. Dean was recorded. And yet with that contract as it

were before his eyes, he writes and publishes 16 per cent, as the rate to be paid for all moneys collected under it.

It will be seen, also, that it was not a private contract between myself and Mr. Dean, but one with which the Trustees were well acquainted.

THE RAT STORY.

But the following extract from the 36th page of the College History is a fabrication sufficiently outrageous to make one's blood curdle. He says: "Some three years ago Mr. Blake, brother-in-law of Mrs. A. S. Dean, was Assistant Treasurer, and while in that office he made out with great care and labor an alphabetical list, in a large blank book, heavily bound, of all the Scholarship-holders who could be obtained. After Mr. Blake returned to New-York City, Mr. Dean occupied the office, and before long this large book was missing. The matter was inquired into, it is said, when it appeared that Mr. John Kershner, a member of the Executive Committee, had last seen the book in Mr. Dean's house. Mr. Dean was then asked where the book was; he replied that he did not know *certainly* what had become of it; *probably the rats had eaten it up!*"

"Since that time, when anything disappears, it is jocosely hinted "*that the rats have eaten it up.*"

"But seriously: Will not every scholarship-holder ask, "Why did A. S. Dean destroy this valuable book, or keep it concealed? Why did he commit it to the flames or other destructive forces, unless it was to aid himself in swindling the College out of hundreds and thousands of dollars?"

Now the fact in this case is that the book is still in ex-

istence. *I myself took it from the College Office, and forwarded it to Mr. Palmer of New-York, for his use as assignee.*

It is not "eaten by rats" nor destroyed, nor kept concealed, nor committed to the flames or other destructive force; and I understand that Mr. John Kershner denies that Mr. Dean ever made the reply given in the above extract, or that he ever made such a statement to Mr. Allen. Yet, on such a false basis, Mr. A. founds a fling about "swindling the College out of hundreds and thousands of dollars." Now, what must the reader think of the morality of this self-appointed defender of the purity of the Church, this man who is constantly obtruding his own truthfulness and integrity upon his readers?

His book was undoubtedly written in Yellow Springs, where the true state of the case might have been learned if he had desired to be an impartial historian. With equally wilful blindness or malice, he has repeatedly spoken of the College finances, and of Mr. Dean's accounts. He has made representations which *he knew were* false, or he knew nothing whatever concerning them, and in either case the true character of the man is very clearly seen.

HIS STRANGE PRETENSION TO AN INTEREST IN PRAYER MEETINGS.

But perhaps the following presents him in his character as a historian as truly as any paragraph in his book. In speaking of Mr. Mann, he says, "had he manifested an interest in our weekly prayer meetings, had he attended our weekly church meetings, and taken hold heart and hand with us, he might have accomplished great good."

This paragraph is found towards the last part of a book of more than 300 pages, one of the principal inten-

tions of which was to prove that Mr. Mann was one of the most unscrupulous and perfidious of all men; that he had betrayed the whole Christian denomination, that he was an infidel, and that he fostered infidelity in the College. It had been distinctly stated that under Mr. Mann's administration, "*all religious power*" had been prevented from operating on the students," and that "*many who entered its halls, as professing Christians, had been turned aside from the religion of their parents, and become careless or sceptical, if not positively infidel in their views.*"

After laboring through nearly 300 pages to prove Mr. Mann a knave and an infidel, whose influence was most pernicious among the students, he expresses the opinion that "*he might have accomplished great good,*" by attending the prayer meetings. But what "good" such a man as he represents Mr. Mann to be, "could accomplish," in a prayer meeting, it is certainly difficult to discover. And his expressed regret that he was not permitted to take "hold, heart and hand," with Mr. Mann, in such meetings, is most incredible, except on the ground that the moral character of the things of which he is perfectly willing to "take hold, heart and hand," is distinctly intimated.

HE NEVER ATTENDED THE SOCIAL MEETINGS OF THE CHURCH.

But the deception which he intended to practice, and the true character of the historian, are seen in the pronouns "*our*" and "*us.*" The reader is thereby given to understand that HE DID "take hold, heart and hand, in the weekly prayer meetings" and "monthly church meetings." No other inference can be gathered from his language;

yet many of the old Church members here, who attended those meetings regularly, say that they never saw him in either, until after he was left out of the Faculty, when he suddenly became very pious, "taking hold, heart and hand with us." See the following certificates from persons who have been members of the Church in Yellow Springs, for a series of years, who have been faithful to it in all its trials, and whose daily Christian life is above reproach.

CERTIFICATES:

"The undersigned having been for many years members of the Christian Church of Yellow Springs, and regular attendants of its meetings, do hereby certify, that, during the three years in which Mr. Ira W. Allen, was connected with Antioch College, he manifested no interest in the prosperity of the Church in this place. To the best of our recollection, *he was never seen at prayer meetings, at monthly Church meetings, nor Sunday school, during all that time*; neither during the pastorship of Prof. Holmes nor of Elder Summerbell, nor when the Church was destitute of a pastor. He took no interest in the maintenance of preaching here, until the movement in behalf of his co-adjutor, Prof. W. H. Doherty.

Yellow Springs, June, 1859.

Signed :

W. R. KING,
SNOW RICHARDSON,
ELIZABETH OHLWINE,
WEALTHY EDMUNDS,
S. M. LEWIS.

The names of many others might be added to this list, if it were necessary or convenient, but these are sufficient. These are persons who were always in their places in the

meetings of the Church, and the most of them are widely and favorably known abroad. Elder Richardson is known throughout South Western Ohio, as a minister of true piety, good ability, sound judgment and strict integrity. Mr. King, former Secretary of the College Trustees, is widely known in New-York and Ohio. Mrs. Edmunds is well known in our Churches, in New-York, Michigan, Illinois and Ohio; the others are of equally unimpeachable integrity. But no one conversant with the facts, will question the truth of what they say. "Heart and hand with US!"

HE VERY RARELY ATTENDS COLLEGE PRAYER MEETINGS.

Nor was his interests in the religious meetings of the College much greater. There is one important fact in this connection, which should have appeared in this College History.

Mr. Allen was a member of the Faculty of Antioch College for three years, and roomed in Antioch Hall. During all this time, on every Sabbath evening, almost without a single omission, a prayer meeting was held by the students and others connected with the College, in the same building, and but a few steps from his room. With the exception of one term, when he was President of the Christian Association, which made him leader of the prayer meetings, Mr. A. *almost never* attended them, and he took no apparent interest in them. At one time the student, on whom the leading of the meetings devolved, suggested that Mr. A. be re-elected to the place, but the members of the Association said—"No. *A man who has not interest enough in the prayer meeting to attend*

it, unless he holds an office, is not the man for a leader."
So his name was dropped.

"The undersigned were members of the Christian Association of Antioch College, during the time above alluded to, and we hereby certify that the above statements are correct according to our best knowledge and belief.

Yellow Springs, June, 1859.

Signed: H. C. BADGER,
 J. B. WESTON,
 M. G. DEAN,
 ALLEN HILL,
 M. J. MILLER.

The names of James Sallaway, Wm. A. Bell, W. H. Smith, and many others who were attendants of the meetings at the time, might have been added to the above list, if necessary. The fact above stated was notorious. And yet one would think from his pretensions that he was all this time the very spirit and support of all such exercises. But such deceptions are characteristic of his book.

But I cannot follow this tortuous author any farther. I *know* that his book is full of falsehoods, though it gives me no pleasure to say it. Indeed, I have been greatly mortified by Mr. Allen's conduct. Many times it has been thrown in my face that I was instrumental in bringing him to the College. I would for this and for many other reasons, prefer to write pleasant things of him, but in truth I cannot. In justice to myself and to our College, which is of far more importance to the world than either of us, I am compelled to write these things, which plainly show that Ira W. Allen is an untruthful and a dangerous man.

ELI FAY.

MR. MANN'S STATEMENT.

DURING a public life, not now short, one principle has always governed me in regard to noticing or neglecting imputations upon my character or conduct. My rule has always been, to pass by accusations merely personal to myself, but to confront and repel those which endanger or prejudice the *cause* in which I am engaged. In the first case, my character must vindicate itself; but in the second, I must vindicate the cause, lest it should be crushed or seriously wounded, before slow-moving Truth can come to its rescue.

Therefore I now proceed to offer some evidence respecting the veracity of a book, entitled, "History of the Rise, Difficulties and Suspension of Antioch College," which bears on its title page the name of "Ira W. Allen."

The book opens, in the very second paragraph of its Preface, with a broadside upon me. From having been a man who had distended Mr. Allen's capacities of admiration, I had become one worthy of the most contumelious epithets. This transformation was wrought, as he says, "in four years." It will be herein shown that it was wrought in four weeks; namely, in the summer of 1857, between the time when he tried to get a re-appointment as my colleague on the College Faculty, and when

he found that there was not a single one of all the members retained in it, who would consent to serve with him. But for this pointed condemnation by his former colleagues,—by those who had been associated with him for years, and had possessed the best opportunity to unmask him,—his book never would have been written.

It will be observed that in the indictment itself, Mr. Allen virtually acquits me of having done aught amiss either by my open voice or visible hand ; but he charges that, throughout my manifold iniquities, I have “concealed” myself “behind committees, agents and spies.” The first fact, therefore, which an intelligent inquirer will look for is, *the proof of the clandestine agency*. Some connection between their conduct and my instigation of it must be discernible. I am not responsible for the poisonous flow of the river unless proved to be at least one of the fountain-heads. On any other hypothesis, Mr. Allen can number only fools among his disciples. Yet from the beginning to the end of the book, there is neither substance nor semblance of proof that I ever operated through any others, or by means of any others ; that I was brain and they muscles ; that I was main-spring and they wheels ;—I say that there is not one iota of proof of this, from the first to the last word in the book, except his own ever-recurring assertions and innuendoes. No overt acts are alleged ; no clandestine acts are proved.

Again ; no face was ever more pitted with the small-pox than this book is with the signs and indicia of falsehood. The grossest, meanest offences are introduced under an “it was said,” or “we do not know,” or “we hope it was not so,” or under some intimation of a division of plunder, or some other scandalous imputation.

True historians never write so. Only historic forgers resort to such authorities.

Here, I make a collateral, but important remark. Everybody has heard of the financial embarrassments of Antioch College. Hostile relations have sprung up between many of its scholarship-holders and its financial managers. Hence, suspicions, jealousies, respecting the administration of the Institution. Now the point to which I wish to call attention is this: have objectors sufficiently discriminated between its pecuniary and its educational administration? For the latter, I acknowledge myself to a great extent responsible. For the former, not at all. I have never served on its Executive Committees, and on no committee for the appointment of agents or the settlement of accounts. The educational department has demanded my utmost energies.

Hence I am not responsible for the conduct of treasurers or agents, or the application of funds. I was not a member of the Board of Trustees until after the College had become insolvent. My duties were then mainly confined to its literary and scientific side, and I know of no vote which I had ever given in that body, which I regret, or which can be impeached.

I maintain, too, that neither the Faculty nor myself is in any way responsible for the host of evils which this book has inflicted upon the College and the "Christian" denomination. The fact that we could no longer associate with Mr. Allen was painful to us, as it was disreputable to him. But who, in the whole community, has ever heard us bruiting his misconduct abroad? Bad as it was, we should have suffered it to sleep. The publicity now given to it, he has invoked upon himself.

When I took up this book, it would have been far too

self-esteeming in me to suppose that my conduct, for five years, could wholly escape criticism. I had occupied a new and difficult position. My acts were necessarily conspicuous,—performed before thousands of spectators. These spectators brought me to different standards of judgment. What would command the approval of one, would bring down the condemnation of another. My judges, too, have been of all degrees of capacity. I have had a pupil withdrawn from the school because I would not so arrange the classes, as that all her lessons in geography, arithmetic, spelling and grammar could be heard only by a teacher of the “Christian” denomination; and one of the Board of Trustees rebuked me for extravagance, because when the Senior and Junior classes were small, I would not join them together for recitations.

But when I opened the book and saw my name scattered over all its pages, thick as flowers on a June prairie, and it seemed as though some evil spirit had crawled and slavered over every flower, leaving behind him his own vile fetor of dishonor and untruth, I felt a loathing and abhorrence for it, and the spirit that originated it, such as no language can describe.

The representation of myself in that book has no likeness to my own personal identity. I am not the man it portrays, nor of kindred to him. It represents me as animated by feelings which I never felt; as having done scores of things which I never did, and as having plotted and prosecuted plans, schemes, machinations, such as never dwelt in my heart, such as never crossed the threshold of my heart, neither coming in nor going out. Had the mathematical professor mismatched every figure in the Multiplication Table and published it as “A Rec-

ord of Facts," he would not have belied mathematical truth any more than he has now belied moral truth.

Such is the character of the pages, so far as they relate to me, which I propose now to consider.

I cannot, however, undertake to deal with every individual falsehood, in all its details and ramifications. That would be like counting the army of Xerxes, soldier by soldier. I shall strike at the sensorium, and leave the limbs and organs to quiver and die at their leisure.

First, then, independent of moral character, Mr. Allen's book exemplifies the grossest faults of arrangement, order and logical sequence. In no instance does it define a specific offence, array proofs, draw conclusions and then leave the subject. Accusations are made, followed by no proof. Inferences are drawn without any preceding basis of fact. "If his premises had the small-pox, his conclusions wouldn't catch it." A few favorite, beloved falsehoods, are introduced on all occasions, reminding one of the stock-perjurers haunting the purlieus of some Old Bailey Court, who hold themselves in readiness to swear to anything on any trial for a shilling an oath. Of this character are the iteration and reiteration, again and again, that I turned away Mrs. Holmes, that Elder Maple accused me of using him dishonorably, &c., &c.

To all Mr. Allen's allegations that I had mismanaged the Institution and proved false to my trust, I oppose the fact, that Mr. Allen sought to be placed on the Faculty with me, and declared *to my friends*, that I was the most suitable person for the office of President, up to the time of his own ejection. My colleagues were willing to serve with me, but would not serve with him. The Board of Trustees appointed me, but he could not

get an appointment either from them or from their committee.

And how was it with those outside of the Faculty? Whom there does he arraign and charge with offences, such as would disgrace the inmate of a penitentiary?

This book condemns Elder Jacob Reeder, Elder Austin Craig, Elder T. M. McWhinney, Elder O. J. Wait, Elder Eli Fay, Elder John B. Weston, &c., &c., as men utterly untruthful and unworthy of the Christian name. But, take these six gentlemen, persons widely known, of mature age, of firmly established character, and confront them face to face with Ira W. Allen. Can his word stand against their word? Will his character outweigh their character? Nay, will not any one of them counterpoise six or six hundred like him? Should he rush against the solid structure of their reputation, he would be dashed in pieces. Should they lay the weight of their character and veracity upon him, it would grind him to powder.

Take half a dozen of Mr. Allen's most intimate allies and co-adjutors in his work, and compare *them* with the above named gentlemen!

And what character, what property in common, had the above named disinterested and impartial persons, that they should have brought down upon themselves this storm of vituperation? They had one common quality and it was this: They had not promoted Mr. Allen's effort to be re-appointed on the Faculty, of which I was a member, but, after full inquiry they had opposed it. Had he thought of me then, as he now pretends he did, ought he not to have been grateful to them for such an escape?

The strategy of the book,—the plan of its campaign,—

is this : To cause it to be believed that I am hostile to the "Christians" as a religious body, and that I have labored, as it says, to "Unitarianize" the College. Now, could this point be secured as a strong-hold or citadel, the rest of the country would easily be conquered. Could this allegation be proved, I must be a hypocrite, for I have never failed to express my strong preference for the "Christian" platform over that of any other denomination whatever.

On this point, therefore, my assailant was to concentrate whatever forces he could levy, in either world.

I shall now show from which world his recruits have been drawn ; show it by their armor, ensigns, war-cries ; show how he has marshalled and led them on, and how many times some of them have been made to die in his cause.

But before doing this, I wish in one brief sentence to purge myself before my "Christian" brethren. The allegation, then, that I have ever felt either hostility or indifference towards the "Christian" platform ; that I have ever, on any occasion, compromised the interests of our denomination ; that I have ever sought or desired to transfer Antioch College, in substance or form, to any other denomination,—all this I affirm to be as utter, as total and tee-total a falsehood as it is in the power of any intelligence, human or diabolic, to invent.

And now, what is the nature of the proof adduced to establish my treachery to the interests of our denomination?

Since I have been here, I have published three Discourses, specially pertaining to the College, and its interests, educational, moral and religious. Is any traitorous or heretical doctrine or sentence brought forward from any of these ? For five years, I had never failed to

take my turn in the Week-Day and Sabbath services of the Chapel. Imperfectly performed, I admit; but from the great extent and variety of topics there introduced or discussed, does there arise one solitary whisper to condemn me? For about four years, I had the sole charge of the Sabbath School,—*taking the Scriptures in course*, as far as I went. Did any enemy of the Bible ever find me on his side? I have taught Moral Philosophy and Natural Theology to each Senior Class. Did I ever scatter heresies there? All these printed pamphlets, I have reason to believe Mr. Allen read. A great majority of my Sabbath Discourses he heard. Many of my Sunday School instructions he attended. Had I left an enemy in ambush in any of all these places, would not Mr. Allen have found him and put a trumpet in his mouth and sent him blowing through all the camp of our Israel? Why then, did not Mr. Allen resort to his invention in this field as well as in others? Because, had he done so, he well knew that the whole Faculty, a thousand students and a multitude of other disinterested hearers would have shouted forth their denial. Nor had I been intent upon what he charges upon me, is it in human nature to suppose that I should have foregone all those opportunities to accomplish, or at least to subserve my purpose?

But on the other hand, suppose a vindictive man to spurn all considerations of truth from his soul; suppose him to pass all falsehoods in review, intent only on selecting the most damaging one, what accusation could he make, at once more plausible to strangers and more injurious to me, than to charge me with infidelity to the "Christian" denomination? And this for obvious reasons:

1. Before coming here, I wrote frankly to the Com-

mittee or Board that elected me, telling them that my religious associations had long been with the Unitarians. Never having lived in a community of "Christians," I had preferred the Unitarians to any other of the so-called liberal bodies. This fact being generally known, there would be a kind of plausibility in the falsehood that I still retained my former preferences.

2. There are many "Christians" who have a strong jealousy of the Unitarians, and the infusion of suspicion into their minds would alienate them from me.

3. All good men know and lament how prone even professedly religious men are to accept and believe this sort of imputation on another's character, especially if their pecuniary interests are in any way involved in the question.

How then could my assailant find a more cheap or effective weapon in all the arsenals of falsehood than to charge me with unfaithfulness to the "Christian" brotherhood?

And what form does the charge assume? This, namely, that certain teachers who were once here, are not here now; but, as it is averred, have been driven away by me. He does not name all the teachers who have been here, NOR HALF OF THEM, but makes a special selection adapted to his sinister purpose. Were I to draw up Mr. Allen's argument for him in a logical and intelligible form, which he has nowhere done, it would stand thus:—Certain teachers have been sent to Antioch who are not there now. These teachers were specially devoted to the "Christian" cause, namely, Mr. Doherty, Mr. McKinney, Mr. and Mrs. Holmes, Mr. Allen, Mr. Burlingame, Miss Shaw and Miss Chamberlain, now Mrs. Burlingame. These teachers Mr. Mann wrongfully drove

away. *Ergo*, Mr. Mann is hostile to the "Christian" denomination. Is not this the length, breadth and thickness of it?

But were these the only teachers who have been here and left? Not half. Witness Messrs. Craig, Pennell, Zachos, Hoyt, Kelton, Coburn, Sobieski, and Webber, (the latter introduced to us through Messrs. Allen and Burlingame,) and Misses Gallant, Ballou, Dorr, and Eastman,—twelve against eight.

Why this suppression of the truth, which according to the old legal axiom, is equivalent to the assertion of falsehood. And are not Messrs. Craig and Coburn as sound "Christians" as Mr. Doherty who came here, almost directly from the pastorship of a Unitarian Church in Rochester, N. Y., or as Mr. Allen himself, who recently told Elder John Ellis of Dayton, Editor of the *Gospel Herald*, that if he were not successful in the present controversy, he could join the Presbyterians? Mr. Kelton also has always been understood here to be a "Christian." So that Mr. Allen left out almost as many "Christians" from his list as he included. But the omitted were friendly to the College and to me, and therefore it did not suit his purpose to name them.

He left it to be inferred too, that all of his list were members of the "Christian" Church. But this was not true of Mrs. Holmes, Mr. Burlingame or Miss Chamberlain. So that we find his very premises to be untrue.

But did I turn away the teachers included in his list? NOT ONE OF THEM. Had religious reasons anything to do with their leaving? NOT IN THE CASE OF A SINGLE ONE OF THEM.

As this is his main argument, I will consider it and annihilate it piece-meal.

Did I turn Mr. Doherty away? He, like every other member of the Faculty, myself included, was voted out of office, at the time of the assignment,—the College having no means to pay salaries. Up to that time, no word of conflict had ever passed between Mr. Doherty and me, but upon one occasion, and that only three or four days before; and he subsequently acknowledged to me that his complaint had been founded on a misapprehension. As everybody here knows, the reason of Mr. Doherty's non-re-appointment was the almost universal remonstrance of the College classes against him. I never saw the remonstrance against him; never instigated nor encouraged it. The book does not contain one particle of evidence that connects me with that affair. When the question was finally decided by the committee, I was hundreds of miles away, and no correspondence ever passed between them and myself on the subject.

Both parts of the charge, therefore fail; that I turned Mr. Doherty away, and that he left for religious reasons. I do not mean to say that, after the very decided and almost universal expression by the students of his unfitness for his place, I should have been in favor of his re-instatement. This, however, is a very different question.

Did I turn Mr. McKinney away, *and for religious reasons*? Let the party alleged to have suffered the injury testify. Mr. McKinney knew that ill-minded men had attributed his leaving to me. On several public occasions, therefore, he made open, public denial of that allegation, fully exonerating me from the charge. In particular, on the 29th day of October, 1857, at a Convention held at Franklin, O., Mr. McKinney repeated the statement. Mr. Allen was present and heard it. But lest

his oral denial should not reach everybody who had heard the falsehood, he published the following card in the *Gospel Herald*, January 7th, 1858 :

“ BR. MAPLE.—I am informed that there are those who state that I was forced to leave my Chair in Antioch College, in consequence of religious opposition. This is incorrect; not one word of truth in it. Nor was I driven away. It was the regret of all, I believe, that I left when I did. Up to the time of my retiring, there had been, so far as I know, harmony of feeling in matters of religion, between the members of the Faculty and myself.

I hope this will put to rest, now, and forever, such report, if in circulation, which is without truth or foundation in fact. For my leaving the College, I alone am responsible. I repeat for myself and no one else.

[Signed,]

A. L. MCKINNEY.

Troy, O., Nov. 21, 1857.

Any reader of Mr. Allen's book cannot fail to see how studiously he conned the *Gospel Herald*. Could he have failed to see this card? At any rate, he heard the oral statement in the Franklin Convention. What shall be thought of a man who, after this positive knowledge, could assert or insinuate that I caused Mr. McKinney's removal, and because he was a “Christian?”

One word more on this point: If Mr. McKinney, in my presence, will *now* say that we ever had any such disagreement on religious grounds, and that I drove him away, I will withdraw all objection not only to this falsehood but to all the falsehoods in Mr. Allen's book;—and did ever mortal man offer so large a concession?

Was Mr. Holmes driven away from Antioch College, and by me?

Of all the evils engendered or occasioned by Ira W. Allen, there is none I more deeply deplore than the new and false relation he created between the Rev. Thomas

Holmes and myself. Mr. Holmes was a gentleman of the liveliest religious sensibilities. He co-operated with me in all my plans to make Antioch College, in point of moral and religious character, a model Institution. On a great variety of subjects we sympathized strongly, so that, on the briefest acquaintance, our spirits ran together like two drops of water. But for the dark shadow of Ira W. Allen, not a cloud or a vapor would ever have come between us.

Fortunately, most abundant means exist for showing who was Mr. Holmes' first and only enemy in Antioch College,—Ira W. Allen himself.

Soon after Mr. Allen's arrival here, he began speaking to me, privately, of Mr. Holmes' incapacity to be a teacher. He affirmed, again and again, not only that Mr. Holmes was no teacher, but that he could never make one. These views, I earnestly combated. At length he referred me to some class papers which, he said, Mr. Burlingame had obtained from Mr. Holmes, and had exhibited to him. I replied that even supposing present deficiencies in Mr. Holmes' classical attainments, he had the power of rapid acquisition, he had diligence, and he would soon supply them; and further, that I hoped, before long, he would visit Europe, and render himself a distinguished scholar in his department. Mr. Allen persisted that no study in Europe and no amount of practice would ever qualify him for a Professor; that his defects were radical and organic; and then he brought another story about more errors in class papers found by Mr. Burlingame, and exhibited to him. All these stories about the papers, Mr. Holmes declares to be in spirit untrue.

I solemnly affirm that Mr. Allen's repeated declarations and specifications of proof respecting Mr. Holmes' incompetency were the first and among the strongest reasons that induced me to urge a visit to Europe upon Mr. Holmes.

Hear Prof. Pennell's testimony upon this subject. The following are his words copied, from among many things, in a statement now lying before me :

“ Very soon after Mr. Allen's return from Europe, he began to make unfavorable criticisms on Mr. Holmes. At a later period he repeatedly said to me, that Mr. Holmes was utterly incompetent for his position ; that he had become convinced of this fact when he first met him at West Newton, [Mass.,] some months before the opening of the College ; that he was now confirmed in these opinions by the statements of students, and especially by what Mr. Burlingame had told him of Mr. Holmes' errors in writing or correcting his Greek exercises, and he affirmed further, that no amount of opportunity for study could ever fit him for his place. These statements were repeated to me by Mr. Allen with particular distinctness during the meeting of the Trustees at which Mr. Holmes asked leave of absence.

“ It is my opinion that Mr. Allen was the principal agent in initiating the steps which led to all that was unpleasant in Mr. Holmes' departure. During all this period, I frequently heard Mr. Mann express his confidence in Mr. Holmes' usefulness and ultimate success.”

The following is Mr. Fay's statement on the same subject :

“ In the latter part of the winter of 1855 I attended a meeting of the Trustees of the College, held in the College buildings. It was understood very early in the meeting that a resolution would be presented granting

Prof. Holmes leave of absence for one year to enable him to qualify himself more fully for the Greek Chair which he was then filling. Mr. I. W. Allen knew that such a resolution would be presented, as he helped to shape that matter himself; and he learned that I intended to vote against it. He immediately sought me out and took me into a room with himself alone, and labored with me for a full half hour to induce me to vote for that resolution. He told me that he and Mr. Burlingame had been watching Mr. Holmes, and that they had detected him in a great many mistakes in his recitations. He showed me a paper on which he said the mistakes were recorded, and he assured me over and over again that Mr. Holmes was not qualified for his Chair. He said Mr. Holmes must certainly leave for a time. I asked him what should be done with Prof. Holmes' Chair. He replied: 'I will take it. You know that I preferred the Greek from the first.' I then asked what should be done with his, (Allen's) Chair, and he replied: 'Holmes can take it. He can go to Cambridge and prepare for the Mathematical Chair in four months. He is better fitted for Mathematics than for Greek.' During that visit to Yellow Springs Mr. Allen said far more to me against Mr. Holmes as a Professor than all others, and manifested more anxiety to have him leave Yellow Springs.

May 24, 1859.

E. FAY."

What ought to be done to the neck of a cuckoo, which after fraudulently laying its own vile eggs in the nest of a sparrow for incubation, then charges upon the latter the offence of begetting its own illegitimate progeny.

Elder Pike of Newburyport, Messrs. Fay, Weston and others know that I was in favor of having Mr. Holmes come back to the College after his return from Europe

Thus much respecting my driving Mr. Holmes abroad because he was a "Christian."

In regard to Mrs. Holmes, the case is still worse for my accuser.

1st. She was not a member of the "Christian" Church, and 2nd, she was never dismissed.

Let this latter fact be borne in mind by the reader, while he remembers how repeatedly and persistently the book avers or implies that she was dismissed; how her "bright hopes were blasted," and on page 17, this is called a "fiendish act."

The truth is this: The committee on Teachers consisted of four members, of which I was one. This committee made a special agreement with Mrs. Holmes to teach *for one year, and one year only*. She was engaged too, *on probation*, with an express agreement, that if satisfaction were not given, the contract was not to be renewed.

Satisfaction was not given. At the close of the year, the head of the Preparatory Department, Prof. Zachos, drew up a list of specifications against her, which was presented to the committee. This paper is still extant, and can be seen by any one who has any reasonable curiosity to see it. On page 17th Mr. Allen says, "No true and valid reasons [for her dismissal] have ever been or can be adduced." Prof. Zachos gives the reasons.

Nor did I ever give any "assurances" that Mrs. Holmes should be retained, irrespective of conduct, and of the probationary terms on which she was engaged. See pp. 17, 88, 90.

On this point, Mr. Fay states:

"I was a member of the committee on Teachers, at the

time Mrs. Holmes was engaged, and the contract with her was made by me.

She was engaged on probation. It was expressly understood and often repeated, that if satisfaction were not given, the contract was not to be renewed. And I never made any pledges to Mr. or Mrs. Holmes which conflicted in the least with that contract, or which annulled it in any respect.

ELI FAY."

But what gives this case its peculiar hue of blackness is this : Notwithstanding all the book now says to arouse public sympathy in behalf of Mrs. Holmes and to hold Mr. Allen aloft, as doing chivalrous knight-service in her defence, yet while she was still a teacher and before the present occasion arose, he was himself the most frequent of all her accusers, and the most severe in his condemnation of her conduct. Again and again did he present her misdoings before the Faculty, and used language which if justified by her acts would prove her unworthy of her place, and would amply vindicate the committee on Instruction for refusing to renew the engagement with her. Hear what Prof. Pennell says on this point :

"The first complaint concerning Mrs. Holmes which I heard, was presented to the Faculty by Mr. Allen. The Faculty made him the bearer of a message to her, after which he reported that she was 'contumacious,' and that he had, after speaking repeatedly, locked her room, taken the key from the door and placed it in the office."

Mr. Zachos, in a letter to me, testifies as follows :

"I thought it my duty at the time, [at the expiration of her year,] to make objections to Mrs. Holmes as a Teacher in my Department, and subject to my control, and at your special request, I reduced these objections to writing.

“On the only two or three occasions on which the conduct of Mrs. Holmes was arraigned before the Faculty as to her observance of certain regulations of the Preparatory Department, Mr. Allen was the chief accuser and loudest complainant; and I may add, was the chief sufferer from the annoyance which her disregard of those regulations imposed on others.”

Mr. Pennell also makes the following statement :

“Mr. Allen, about this time, made repeated and bitter accusations against Mrs. Holmes. I am surprised that Mr. Allen, after taking the active part he did in condemning and reproving Mrs. Holmes, should now claim to have been her friend.”

It is this condemner of Mrs. Holmes who is now my condemner for the “fiendish act” of dismissing her, although she was not dismissed at all; and for dismissing her too, from religious antipathies, when, whether dismissed or not, religious opinions had nothing to do with the case; and among all the objectors to her, he was foremost.

Before Mr. Allen had been here six months, he began plying Mr. Fay, (then in New-York) with letters “strictly confidential,” but most hostile to me.

On page 12 of the book, he quotes from a letter of Mr. Fay, as follows:

“Now, Sir, I desire to write to Mr. Mann myself and tell him that you and Professor Holmes and lady, and Mr. Burlingame and Miss Shaw agree in thinking that partiality has been shown to those teachers who were recommended by himself and Miss Pennell, (now Mrs. A. S. Dean,) also that it is the belief of the whole, that teachers from the Christians are treated with disrespect, and that they do not intend longer tamely to submit to it,” &c., &c.

And about the 20th of May (1855) I received a letter from Mr. Fay, making, among many others, the allegation as found in Mr. Fay's letter on p. 14, and affirming that "Prof. Allen, Mr. Burlingame and Miss Shaw do not consider their positions pleasant or desirable." Mr. Fay gave me no intimation in this letter, as to his authority.

Being unable to conceive of any reason why they, or any other parties should complain, I called on Mr. Burlingame and Miss Shaw, (I shall speak of my interview with Mr. Allen, by and by,) and made known my errand. Both denied, in the fullest manner, that they had ever authorized any person to make any such representation respecting them. I requested them to put their statements in writing, and the subjoined are exact copies of what they then wrote. Four days after Mr. Burlingame's first note, he wrote me another, a little more full on one point. Both follow :

" Antioch College, May 25th, 1855.

HON. HORACE MANN,—DEAR SIR:—In compliance with your request, I take pleasure in stating that our intercourse, of a social nature, has always been agreeable, and that I consider the government of the Institution salutary and efficient. Yours very respectfully,

[Signed,]

H. D. BURLINGAME."

Gent's Hall, May 29th.

HON. HORACE MANN—Dear Sir,—In compliance with your request, I cheerfully state that our intercourse of a social nature, has always been agreeable; and I am confident that I have never said, nor authorized any person to say that, owing to the mal-administration of the College, my position was unpleasant and undesirable.

Yours very truly

[Signed.]

H. D. BURLINGAME.

Copy of Miss Shaw's Letter.

“Whatever statements have been made with regard to my position as a teacher in Antioch College being an unpleasant one, resulting from circumstances over which Mr. Mann, or any other member of the Faculty has had control, I wish the person by whom such a statement was made to Mr. Mann, to know that I cherish no unpleasant feelings toward any one connected with the Institution's government; since I have never had cause to complain of the treatment I have received from any one connected with it, or of the confiction of the Institution's discipline, either with my personal feelings or ideas of justice—and whenever I may withdraw myself from my connection with it, it will be with the feeling that no unpleasant misunderstandings, and no ill-will on the part of any, has been the cause of whatever unhappiness I may have experienced during that connection.”

[Signed,]

LETITIA J. SHAW.”

The assertion, therefore, that Miss Shaw was turned away or even dissatisfied, is utterly false; I never had an unpleasant word with her, or any but kind feelings towards her; she gave good satisfaction as a teacher, and I was very sorry she did not continue with us.

The book adds, p. 15: “The reader will therefore notice that Mr. Fay informed Mr. Mann, ‘that there had been a *general* uneasiness among *all* the teachers ever sent there by the Christians,” &c.

This is denied by Mr. Burlingame and Miss Shaw, in the above notes. Thus Mr. Allen fills Mr. Fay with his own fabrications and then quotes the echo of them from Mr. Fay, to prove their truth. We have heard of reasoning in a circle; this is *falsifying* in a circle.

Before the close of the year Mr. Burlingame's relations were so fully developed that when the proposition was made in the Trustees' meeting, to supersede Mr. Zachos and appoint him, I opposed the change. I opposed it, because I believed the best interests of the College forbade it; I opposed it not with passion or temper, but with reason and argument, as became my position and the merits of the case.

After the adjournment, one of the Trustees told me that the meeting had been packed, that neither he nor several others of the Trustees would have been present but for the purpose of superseding Mr. Zachos. They had been clandestinely tampered with and summoned for that special end.

A long story is told about Miss Chamberlain, now Mrs. Burlingame. I shall make a short one of it. She was employed through Mr. Burlingame's agency and recommendation, he withholding from their committee the private relations to each other. Neither of them were members of the Christian Church. If Christians have been made to believe that either Mr. Burlingame or Miss Chamberlain came here as their representatives, they have been imposed upon.

Doubtless he induced the committee to employ her in view of a bride, but that bride was not the Church.

On page 21, it is said that I wrote her a "letter informing her of her appointment, with my own hand," thereby implying my responsibility for that appointment. I knew nothing of her or her appointment, until the New-York members of the committee, to whom Mr. Burlingame applied in her behalf, (and his own,) had engaged her, and had requested me to notify her,

which I did, but merely as an official act. As soon as she came, the motives of Mr. B. in securing the engagement developed.

Page 22nd, is covered with falsehoods respecting Miss Chamberlain. It says that the resolution which the committee passed was not intended to apply to Miss Chamberlain, which it was; but was intended to apply to certain other teachers named, which it was not.

Miss Chamberlain was employed to teach German and French; she began with the German, and proved herself utterly incompetent. For proof of this let her class be inquired of. Nay, let Mr. Allen himself be inquired of. Throughout his whole statement of her case, on page 22, 23, and again, on page 34, he speaks as though she was 'abundantly qualified;' of her 'surprise' at the suggestion by the committee of an examination; of his telling me that he regarded the conduct of the committee with 'abhorrence,' 'that no teacher having the least self-respect could submit to such indignity,' and that he 'would not take part in a transaction of such inhuman cruelty.' He never used any such language to me, but it would be so much the worse for him if he had; for a note of his now before me, shows that he knew all about the dissatisfaction with her, of her German class, and their fears that she would not be able to teach French. Mr. Allen was on the committee for preparing the programme for the ensuing term, and, Nov. 26th, 1855, he wrote to me as follows: "I was appointed to learn their wishes, [the wishes of the class, about studying German,] and in learning their desires I learned also the state of their minds towards their teacher, Miss Chamberlain."

"I find that they have but little confidence in her ac-

curacy in German; and that they are somewhat fearful that she may not be perfectly accurate in French." And he then goes on to speak of points in which *he himself knew* her to be inaccurate. Thus, with all his desire to adapt himself to Mr. Burlingame's wishes and to defend a protégée, these two facts were put on record by himself at the time; that he had personal knowledge of her deficiencies and of the dissatisfaction of her pupils with her teaching.

The truth is, the dissatisfaction of the class was extreme and Miss Chamberlain never would have been brought here but as the prospective Mrs. Burlingame.

Thus evaporate all the false exhalations from Mr. Allen's brain about my attempts to Unitarianize the College, by driving away the Christian teachers. Mr. Doherty was excluded by the remonstrance of the students which I neither instigated nor encouraged. Mr. McKinney left for his own reasons. I desired that Mr. Holmes and Miss Shaw should continue as teachers. Mrs. Holmes, Mr. Burlingame and his wife, never represented the "Christians" in the College. On the other hand, Dr. Craig, Mr. Kelton and Mr. Coburn, as true friends as the "Christian" cause ever had, have left the College, its friends, and I trust, my friends.

But whether a man joins or leaves the College, it must be from a wrong motive, and I must be the instigator.

Pages 9 and 10 charge Dr. Warriner with joining the Church to obtain a Professorship, and that I was accessory to the sin. The number of untruths is just equal to the number of the charges.

Page 10, professes to recite a conversation between Prof. H. C. Badger, (then a student,) and myself. On this Mr. Badger observes:—

“The statements on page 10 of Mr. Allen’s so called ‘History,’ referring to an interview between Mr. Mann and myself in the presence of Mr. Allen, I feel called upon to brand as a falsehood. An interview did occur, but the statement above mentioned so far as relates to the part taken by Mr. Mann and Mr. Allen, is a malicious misrepresentation.

[Signed.]

H. C. BADGER.”

Here, for brevity’s sake, I may as well speak of his other representations of interviews between us.

When I first heard of Mr. Fay’s startling list of charges, part of which are on page 14, I called on Mr. Allen in a private and friendly way; for I then had no knowledge that he was their author, and I had no conception of the dimensions of his iniquity. He had met me every day, often several times a day. He visited at my house. He always accosted me with the same starchy smile, and generally offered his hand to me twice,—both at meeting and at parting. But during all this time I had not allowed myself to suspect that there was venom under his tongue, and a dagger in his sleeve. At our interview he was mealy mouthed and deprecatory. He asserted that he had never written but two or three letters to Mr. Fay, on College affairs, and said he should be willing to have me see their contents. Our conversation was long, and it closed with a promise on his part that he would never take that course again; but that if, in future, he should have occasion to take any exceptions to my conduct, he would speak of it first of all to me, in private. We shook hands and parted. He forthwith reclaimed all his letters from Mr. Fay, that proof of his treachery might be suppressed, and he then immediately began to create and bring into

line that long drawn procession of falsehoods to Mr. Fessenden, which ended in his giving Mr. Fessenden and Mr. Weston that astounding lesson in the theory and practice of lying, which places him in the foremost rank in that department,—the Paul Morphy of his class.

Not satisfied with this course of conduct towards me, it is consistent with his notions of honor to go out of his way to disparage Mrs. Mann.

During his five weeks' illness, Mrs. Mann proffered him every comfort our house afforded, and even the house itself; and she took charge, without the thought of compensation, of his German class. He says also that I made him "daily calls."

On his recovery, he wrote Mrs. Mann a note, of which the first paragraph is as follows :

"MRS. MANN:—It has given me much pleasure and quietude of mind, during the sickness and convalescence of the past few weeks, to know that my German class has been so fortunate as to enjoy your instructions."

But in his book, p. 13, he says, that "not many days elapsed" after Mrs. Mann took the class, "before some of the class called on me and wished me a speedy recovery, for said they,—we have no ambition to study or carefully prepare our lessons under the directions of Mrs. Mann." He then gives her a slur in regard to French, and adds, p. 14, that "Mrs. Mann did not win laurels in the German department, as was evident when I again took the class, about five weeks after I was taken sick."

Mr. Allen may have his option, whether this palpable contradiction *lies* in his complimentary note to Mrs. Mann, or whether it *lies* in his book,—the compliment and the slur being equally indifferent.

It is perhaps due to Mr. Allen to say, that after Mrs. Mann declined receiving any compensation for her trouble, Mr. Allen presented her with a small book, on the fly leaf of which the price was carefully marked in his own hand writing, and especially noticeable because it was a very large price for so small a book.

Mr. Allen makes great parade of the amount of his labor. He had no more labor than any other member of the Faculty, and when on a special emergency he was solicited to take a German class, he refused to do so, unless he could have extra pay,—pay beyond the regular *pro rata* allowance. This he extorted and received.

In further illustration of the generosity and justice with which he treated College property, I may quote a passage from a letter from Mr. Knapp, the steward, in relation to his quartering himself on the College, without ever making an offer of remuneration, or even of acknowledgment for personal kindness. This letter was addressed by Mr. Knapp to Mr. Allen. The following passage is from a copy made by Mr Knapp :

“ You Sir, [Mr. Allen,] are the last person that ought to complain of College losses. You, when sick, for four or more weeks, lived on the Hall altogether ; commanding the kitchen, the stores, the servants, the wash-house, for which you made no remuneration at all.

“ I know of no other person connected with the College who ever took anything without paying for it, and hence I do not wonder that the charges against Mr. Mann and myself come from you. I know not what course Mr. Mann intends to take in regard to this matter ; but I know that your malicious slanders deserve that public exposure which you will soon get if you do not give some immediate evidence of repentance and reformation.”

Pages 16 and 17, suggest that I objected to Mr. Appleget, as Steward, because of his want of "polish and refinement," but that I have recently interposed to secure his return, hoping that the last step may conciliate the good will which the former had alienated.

All this is sheer fabrication. No person ever heard me utter a disparaging remark against Mr. Appleget, for his want of "polish and refinement," or for any other cause. Nor had I aught to do with his re-appointment—that matter being out of my jurisdiction,—otherwise than to wish him well and do what I could for his success.

The absurdities and misrepresentations of the 19th and 20th pages, can be disposed of in a word.

On opening the College, as we had no Chaplain, nor any means to pay one's salary, the members of the Faculty agreed among themselves to conduct the religious services of the week-days and of the Sabbath, in turn. This was done the first year without objection from any one. The second year, on Mr. Allen's joining us, he said he was new in his classes, and would like to be excused for the first term. We readily acceded, and performed his share of the services for him. He then came into the arrangement and performed his part of the service for a time,—reading sermons from books; for, both writing and extemporizing he judiciously avoided. After a short trial, however, he began to complain, and, at last, intimated refusal. It was then that the conversation occurred to which he refers, and which, and my motive in regard to which, he so egregiously misrepresents. The substance of it was this: I urged the indispensableness of religious exercises for the spiritual well-

being of our students, that, without them, youth would first forget their duties to God, and then their duties to men and to themselves; that the College had no funds for the support of a Chaplain; that his own influence as a teacher would be aided by his public recognition of this duty, which ought to be a pleasure and not a burden; and that I did not think that any person ought to hold himself up before the young as a guide and as an example, who was not willing, in such ways, to avow his interest in the cause of religion. He referred to his week-day duties. I replied that there was not a Professor in the College whose duties were not as arduous as his, (on the supposition that each was equally well qualified, and) that any rule which would exempt him would exempt us all. I then asked him what expedient he would suggest to meet such an exigency. He coolly replied that there was an obvious way by which the services could be performed and he still be excused,—*that the other members of the Faculty could do the whole and let him off!*

Surely a man capable of making such a selfish suggestion offers one strong argument why he should not engage in any religious services.

On p. 19, he speaks of his "conscientious scruples against turning the sacred desk into a rostrum for lectures on Physiology," &c. The only lecture on Physiology we ever had in the Chapel, on Sunday, was delivered there by his friend, Mr. Burlingame.

I shall make brief work of a letter of six pages, (25 to 31) purporting to have been written by Mr. G. L. Salsbury, though any person who knows him, and reads the letter, will know that, as there printed, it was never written by him. When a single shot, striking between

wind and water, and letting day-light through a piratical craft, is sufficient to sink it, it is useless to expend ammunition on the masts and rigging.

On p. 28, Mr. S. is made to say: "He himself, [Mr. Mann,] did not spend at the College, for the first three or four years, actually more than three months per year, but was off attending to his own business, and lecturing at fifty dollars a lecture."

Now here is a specific allegation. No condition is attached. It is not spoken of as hearsay. It is positively affirmed. Mr. Salsbury's name is attached.

What means had Mr. Salsbury of knowing such a fact, had it existed? The same letter shows that he was here but one year. His previous residence was remote. He was not living in any place, nor engaged in any business that would make him specially acquainted with my journeys or sojourns. Yet he makes this positive declaration, covering a period of "three or four years," respecting me and my occupation.

Now, like all Lecturers, as I suppose, I keep memoranda of places and times, where and when I lecture. And I here aver that, according to these memoranda, the whole number of times I lectured, *during term time*, within the three years, which come up to 1856, the time when Mr. Salsbury left, was—FORTY. That is, I lectured *forty* evenings, while, according to his assertion, I must have been away, during the *three* years, (not to say *four*,) nearly eighteen months.

Most of the places I lectured at, in term time, were near by, with the exception of once when I went to New-York, and once when I went to Boston, *on College business at my own expense*. With the exception of the above, my visits to remote places were in vacation.

I also affirm, that during the whole time since I came to the College in 1853, I have never been absent "attending to my own business," for so much as a day at a time, and then only on a visit to some neighboring city, for domestic purposes. If I chose to claim credit from such a source, I could easily prove that I have lost thousands of dollars by neglecting my own business, through my fidelity to College duties.

For what reason, then, has Mr. G. L. S. fabricated this falsehood! Is his name GULLIVER? and does the "L" stand for Longbow? No wonder he could, as he says, "graduate in a year."

Let us look at this matter. By his own showing, he was here but a year. How did he know what I did the year before, or the year after? He being absent, how did he know how much I was present? Did Mr. Allen tell him? The first year Mr. Allen was not here, and if anybody told him so, it was hearsay. There is but one solutio. It is equal audacity and mendacity.

And what I submit is, that if Mr. Salsbury should give such testimony, under such circumstances, in a court of law, not a juror would believe either it, or anything else he should say. The court would lay down such rules of law and morals, as would discard it, the spectators would hoot at it.

I simply add that the other statements and insinuations contained in this letter, about Mr. Blake's or Miss Wilmarth's coming here through my influence; about the young ladies having liberty to board themselves in their rooms; about my not preferring that the students should board in Commons, rather than to board elsewhere; about my hostility, or indifference to the interests of the "Christian" denomination, &c., &c., are, singly and collectively, the spurious coin of the same mint.

Horribly shocking as it is, yet after *such* a letter, written by *such* a man to *such* a man and for *such* a purpose, it was perfectly fitting and proper for Mr. Salsbury to cap the climax of atrocity, by signing himself, "Your brother in Christ." The truth would have compelled him, previous to the last word, to insert *anti*.

There is also a letter on p. 155, purporting to come from Mrs. Salsbury, in which the old story of hostility to the "Christians" is introduced. In all this, she proves herself to be Mr. Salsbury's "help-meet."

Having now sufficiently shown what the *spirit*, the *animus* of Mr. Allen's book is, space and time alike forbid my noticing, in detail, those scores of insinuations and innuendoes, which he has scattered over its pages, without proof, or similitude, or pretence of proof. To examine them in detail, to comment upon and expose them, one by one, would be a task like that of dissecting all the venomous serpents on a continent, and exhibiting fang and poison-sac, of each individual. To an intelligent inquirer, the exhibition of one of a kind will be sufficient. I pass, therefore, to an imputation of special baseness, on p. 71; namely, that I am a defaulter in regard to library moneys.

The committee to examine my accounts was appointed at my request. Even previously to that, I had done what I could, to procure a settlement, but owing to delays, not within my control, it had been postponed. The money deposited with me had long before been expended, except a small sum reserved for the purchase of necessary works, or for very valuable ones, as they might appear. As off-set and security for the small balance, if any, in my hands, the College was owing me thousands of dollars, and what possible motive, under such circum

stances, could I have for delay? The committee declare in their report, that I exhibited to them vouchers for nearly all the money I had received, and that they, the committee, not I, had not time to investigate the case more fully. The report gives no intimation that all was not right. The books were on the shelves of the library, where Mr. Allen had seen and used them for years. Yet on this state of facts, this wretch insinuates a want of fidelity and honesty on my part, and asks flippantly, "Why talk about \$5,500, when so much larger sums have been tossed about like playthings." All this, too, he does, when he well enough knew that my salary, even if it had been paid, would not, with the utmost economy, more than have met the expenses of my position. He knew also, that in addition to five years of service, I had just given five thousand dollars for the redemption of the College. Facts like these, laid over the blackness of common guilt, would turn it white by contrast.

From p. 37, onward to what Mr. Allen calls "Part Second,"—though with his usual want of logic and order, he has no "Part First,"—there is a studied effort, continued through more than sixty pages, and designed to make the reader believe, that after repudiating the bonds of 1856, (see p. 72) I caused the assignment of the College property to be made in 1857; that I originated the plan, engineered it through and consummated it; and all this for the sake of excluding Mr. Allen and Mr. Doherty from the Faculty, and of transferring the College, body and soul, real estate and corporate franchises, to the Unitarians.

If all this can be called an argument, a more bungling and illogical one can nowhere be found on record. The

conclusion is set down on p. 73, i. e. in the middle of it. It is intermixed with so much irrelevant matter,—letters, newspaper scraps, &c., &c.,—that it has no continuity of parts, and exhibits no growth from stage to stage. The only trace of system or symmetry it exhibits, consists in its ever-recurring introduction of my name with some sinister imputation. One fact alone pervades and characterizes it from beginning to end: *It is without a particle of proof or truth.*

On all this abominable and heterogeneous conglomeration of things, I wish to submit a few propositions:

1. Was not one of the reasons for the sale of the College property, which the report contains, namely, that the College was running in debt some \$10,000 or \$12,000 a year, and that at that rate its property would soon be exhausted, and its stockholders become personally liable;—was not this a sufficient reason for the assignment, or, at least, sufficient to save its advocates from all suspicion of dishonesty?

2. Did Mr. Allen *at that time* protest against or object to the assignment? Did he ever discover that it was wrong until after his failure to be re-appointed as a member of the Faculty? He was present at the meeting of the Trustees at which the assignment was made. Persons whom he wishes to have us consider his friends, were on the committee that reported it. He was present at the succeeding Stockholders' meeting, when the policy of the measure was fully discussed and a new Board of Trustees elected. At both these meetings, everybody present, who desired it, was allowed to speak. At neither did he utter a whisper against the measure. Why? *He was then expecting to be re-appointed on the new Faculty;*

3. In the whole transaction, as related by himself through sixty dreary pages, (with the exception of my vote in favor of the report to assign, which report was *unanimously* accepted, with the exception of Mr. Harlan, who did not object to it,) has he adduced one tittle of proof that I ever proposed that measure beforehand, or advocated it on its passage, or was a member of any committee, either to prepare it or to execute it?

4. On the committee reporting the assignment, were Messrs. Palmer, Pike and Phillips,—three leaders in the “Christian” denomination. They constituted a majority of the committee. The report was unanimous; but had either one of these three dissented, together with the two members not “Christians,” the report could not have been made. Is it supposable, *firstly*, that I blinded, mesmerized and bamboozled a majority, or rather the whole committee, (for a majority would have answered my purpose,) to obtain an assignment; that thereby, *secondly*, I might cause the whole Faculty to be dismissed; that thereby, *thirdly*, I might prevent Mr. Allen, *the next year*, from being re-elected on the Faculty?

5. On the Board of Trustees present and voting for the acceptance of the report to assign, as appears from the book itself, were Messrs. F. A. Palmer, D. P. Pike, Amasa Stanton, John Phillips, John Kershner, J. P. Corey, J. C. Burghdurf, Wm. R. King, James Maxwell, and S. Stafford—ten of the sixteen present, all unimpeachable members and friends of the “Christian” denomination, and all voting to accept the report. By what wile, artifice, fraud, hoax, juggle, delusion, legerdemain, conjuration or stultification; by what fiction, romance, shuffle, fraud or mental ambushade, did I overreach, mystify, hoodwink, inveigle and befool these ten

men, to make them, as my dupes, gulls, victims, vote for the assignment against their judgment and conscience, so that the next year I might oust Mr. Allen from his Professorial Chair? Why could I not have been satisfied with a majority? Why waste my precious powers of circumvention to cajole the whole?

6. "On the following day," says Mr. Allen, "there was a meeting of the scholarship-holders." At this meeting the whole matter of the assignment underwent another elaborate discussion. Mr. Allen was present. I think no protesting or dissenting syllable was uttered against the measure by any one, certainly Mr. Allen said nothing against it; and he would have been heard had he offered to speak; for such was our democratic custom.

Yet it is under these circumstances that Mr. Allen interpolates his final conclusion into the middle of his argument, as follows: "This one act in Mr. Mann's drama, had, no doubt, been played to his satisfaction."

Now let any person who has once read this part of Mr. Allen's book, submit to the humiliation and disgust of reading it again, and then see if all the above positions are not legitimately taken. Let him see whether, with the exception of the vote which I gave for the acceptance of the report to assign, he has exhibited through all these felonious pages a particle, an effluvium, an aura, an infinitesimal of proof, "a smell of evidence," that I had any connection with the measure as author, advocate, or executor. The whole is the fetid exhalation of that vengeful and fiery cauldron he carries in his bosom.

On p. 136, Mr. Allen cites a remark or two of the late Hon. Daniel Webster against me, occasioned by my dissent from his 7th of March speech, and his subsequent political course.

Two observations on this will suffice :

First: If within the circumference of Mr. Allen's nature there is any spot of sincerity or principle, he agreed and sympathized with me on every point where Mr. Webster assailed me. In order to injure me, therefore, he makes alliance with his own enemy as well as mine, and borrows words which he himself condemned and which derive all their strength from having been used against me in a case where he was on my side. Is not this loving one's enemies in a new way?

Second: Doubtless Mr. Allen supposed that by publicly referring to a case where that intellectual Goliath flourished his "weaver's beam" and talked "Philistine" at me, he should cause me pain. But how fallaciously he judges of feelings which pertain to honor and rectitude. If among all the acts of my public life, Fate should ordain that only one of them should be remembered by my children or my friends, I would select that one before all others, when, single-handed and alone, I struck at the foremost intellectual man in the nation, because I believed that, alike in defiance of the laws of God and the welfare of man, he was consummating a gigantic national wrong. And now, even in this country, where party relations so warp ingenuous minds, are not fifty to one of all the men whose names History will love to cherish and preserve, already on my side of the question there in issue between Mr. Webster and myself; and out of this country is not all this illustrious order of men, the Von Humboldt's and Lord Brougham's of every land, without exception, on the same side? Little as Mr. Allen knows of the sentiments which actuate honorable minds, he knew quite as little of the pride of

the reminiscence which, in my heart, his malignant citation would awaken.

One of the most dishonest portions of the book may be found on pp. 142 and 149. This contains Mr. Allen's version of the "Rise, Difficulties and Suspension" of his attack upon the character of one of the female assistant teachers.

Let this story be told by Prof. Pennell, whose fairness and veracity will be questioned by no one living man :

"A meeting of the Faculty was called to investigate charges made by Mr. Allen against a teacher in the Preparatory school—Miss Wilmarth. After protracted investigation, no charges being substantiated and Miss Wilmarth's explanation having been heard, the Faculty were all satisfied. Mr. Allen expressed his satisfaction also, walked across the room and shook hands with Miss Wilmarth, and the Faculty separated.

"Mr. Allen was at this time the Secretary of the Faculty. At a subsequent meeting it was discovered that the record had been so made up, as to leave Miss Wilmarth still under arraignment—the fact of her having been accused being recorded, that of her having been acquitted suppressed. Mr. Doherty moved that the record be amended, and proposed the words of the amendment, which the Faculty approved. Mr. Allen refused to make the entry, and upon its being insisted on, proposed taking the book to his room to make the entry there. The Faculty insisting, he at last made the proposed addition, then threw the record book down near the President, declaring that he would serve as Secretary no longer. [Signed,] C. S. PENNELL."

Respecting Mr. Allen's statements that I made announcements to the students of matters, as having been

decided by the Faculty, which had never been so decided, and respecting any partiality exercised by myself or Mrs. Dean in behalf of one set of teachers over another, I quote the following from a statement made by Mr. Zachos, who for two years was principal of the Preparatory Department :

“ I answer explicitly, that during the two years of my connection with the College, my memory does not serve me with one case, [when] the President ever announced any thing to the students in the chapel as decided by the Faculty which had not been so decided.

“ Whatever personal or social preferences you or Mrs. Dean might have had [for one teacher over another,] they did not appear in your *official* relations to the teachers, as far as I had any opportunity to observe.”

In answer to the question, whether Mr. Mann ever did go into the Chapel and announce that the Faculty had decided (so or so), when they knew nothing of it, Elder Holmes says :

“ I am very positive he never did. He must be insane who makes such a charge ; for the act would, of course, be repudiated by the Faculty immediately.”

Dr. Craig says :

“ I do not remember that Mr. Mann ever said to the students, or to any others, that ‘ The Faculty have agreed,’ etc., when the Faculty had not agreed. I do remember, however, that Mr. Mann several times came to ask me, (and sometimes sent me to ask Mr. Weston, Mr. Cary, and Dr. Warriner,) about some comparatively little matter, which I should have thought it no impropriety for him to have answered on his own individual authority.”

Mr. Coburn affirms the same.

On pp. 181, 183, 196, and elsewhere, Mr. Allen places Elder Maple on the witness’ stand, to testify that I

treated him "unjustly," in reference to the publication of a Report.

On cross-examination, however, Elder Maple testifies as follows :

"On p. 181, Mr. Allen publishes two letters, or extracts from them. One was written to Mr. Lynn, and the other to Allen. On p. 183, are extracts from another letter of mine, bearing on the same point. In those letters the following passage occurs: 'There are some things in the Committee's Report on the College to which I objected, and told Mr. Mann that they must be left out, or he must not put my name to it; but notwithstanding this, he did put my name to it unjustly.' The facts in regard to this matter are the following: Hon. H. Mann came to my house with the report that he and the other members of the committee had prepared. He read it to me. There was one thing in the address that I objected to; but after some conversation about the objectionable feature, I signed the report. It was left with me to send to Mr. Geary, to be published. I instructed Mr. Geary to strike off a proof, and send it to Mr. Mann to read. The next morning after Mr. Mann was at my house, I read over the report carefully, and I then thought that the feature in it to which I objected, would do harm, and had much better be left out. I sent the report to Mr. Geary, but wrote to Mr. Mann that he had better strike out the part I objected to when he came to read the proof. He replied that he had seen Elder J. G. Reeder, [a member of the same committee,] and that he objected to having it left out. When I received this letter, I wrote to Mr. Mann to leave the objectionable feature out, or omit my name; for I could not consent to have my name connected with the report, and let the

objectionable feature remain. Time passed. The committee's report was published with the objectionable feature somewhat changed, but in substance the same. I heard nothing from Mr. Mann for several weeks, and I thought that he had treated me unjustly in publishing the report as it was, with my name to it. In my correspondence with Messrs. Lynn, Allen, and O. J. Wait, I expressed my feelings pretty freely on the matter. After I had written to the above gentlemen, I received a letter from Mr. Mann that explained the whole matter, and exonerated him from all blame. He was absent, lecturing in the West, when my second letter reached the Springs, and the committee's report was published before he saw it. This set the matter right in my mind. I wrote to Brother Wait, explaining the matter to him, and freeing Mr. Mann from all blame. I also explained the matter to Prof. I. W. Allen, five months before his book was published. Notwithstanding this, he made use of my letters to prove what he knew to be false. I also explained the matter to Mr. J. T. Lynn. These are the facts in the case, and they free Mr. Mann from all blame in the matter."

This plain statement needs but little explaining. It may be observed, however, that the "objectionable feature," which Mr. Maple refers to, related to some conduct of Mr. Allen and his party, in regard to the subject-matter of the report; so that Mr. Maple made objection to its being published only to save him and them from exposure. He, however, signed it. When his letter reached me, renewing the objection which he first made and then waived, I submitted it to one of our colleagues on the committee, Elder Reeder, who objected to the proposed omission, and it was therefore retained. "Time

passed," as Mr. Maple says; vacation came, and I was absent when his second letter arrived. That Mr. Maple had communicated any complaint to Messrs. Allen and Lynn, I did not know nor suspect; that he had to Elder Wait, and had afterward retracted, I did know; for Mr. Wait sent me an account of both "bane and antidote" at the time. I answered Mr. Maple's second letter as soon as I received it.

The two main facts are these: First, I stand entirely acquitted; and, second, all the letters of Mr. Maple, from which Mr. Allen quotes, whether to himself, or to his comrade, Mr. Lynn, (Dean Swift says "comrade" is derived from "come rogue,") are dated in 1857; the book appeared in the autumn of 1858. Months before its publication, therefore, Mr. Maple had disabused the minds of Messrs. Allen and Lynn of the erroneous impression he had given them respecting my conduct in relation to the report. We not only have his positive statement on this point, but Mr. Wait, to whom he told the same story, knows that he rectified the matter to him. Now, will Mr. Allen deny that Mr. Maple retracted his imputation against me, before the book appeared? *Nothing more probable, if he dare.* Had he not better consider some points, however, before venturing upon this? Will he deny it for Mr. Lynn also, or Mr. Lynn for himself? Both lived in Yellow Springs, within a few minutes' walk of each other, the last year. In their hostility to the College, since Mr. Allen was spurned by his former colleagues on the Faculty, they have been Siamese twins. Whatever *Chang* did, *Eng* knew, by a spiritual affinity, closer than any connection through an umbilical cord. Have they not talked over this matter of my exculpation by Mr. Maple, again and again?

Especially did they not, when Mr. Lynn gave Mr. Allen the letter of Mr. Maple to him, for publication in the book? Are there not other persons who know the facts from their own mouths?

However all this may be, and whether they plead guilty or not guilty, I stand acquitted; and Mr. Allen's whole charge against me, on this point, is a falsity, in regard to the thing, if not falseness in his own heart.

On pp. 220-2, a laborious effort is made to convict me of misrepresentation in regard to student-boarders, in the village.

In commenting upon the question of a thousand of bones, the half thousand of muscles, the myriads of blood-vessels and the millions of nerves in the human body, Dr. Paley speaks with wonder and admiration of what he calls their "*package*,"—the skill with which so many things are stowed into so small a space. The *package* of falsities in the few pages now under consideration equals any thing to be found in the human system; but must have had an infinitely different kind of author.

1. A remonstrance is introduced purporting to have been signed by thirty-three persons against the 37th Rule of the Faculty, (at first it was the 36th,) respecting students boarding in the village.

I do not see why this remonstrance should be introduced *against me*. The 37th Rule was adopted by a unanimous vote of the Faculty, Mr. Allen voting for it with the rest. It, therefore, proves as much against him as against me.

But is not that Rule founded in good reason? If so, the remonstrance only disparages those who made it. The Rule simply requires that the boarding-house keeper should "promise to exercise parental supervision over

them [his boarders,] and report to the President, or some member of the Faculty, any violation of the rules of the College which they commit." Is not this a most reasonable and salutary rule? When the students board at the Hall, they are on our premises and within our jurisdiction. When they cross the threshold of a citizen, they go where we cannot follow them, where our eye cannot see, nor our hand restrain them. Why, then, should we not require of the citizen who receives student-boarders within his jurisdiction, the same parental care and vigilance which we would exercise did they remain under ours? He receives them from us, why should he not, for the time being, watch them for us? And why should Mr. Allen sanction a remonstrance, which is only a condemnation of a rule, for which he voted?

Again, if the 37th Rule was a good rule, where was the harm in my endeavors to get Mr. Layton to comply with it; and if he was obstinate and refused, did it not show fidelity to duty and a conciliatory spirit in me, when I tried, as he says, "for several weeks, both personally and through others, to influence Mr. Layton and then Mrs. Layton" to do their duty?

2. It is affirmed that the twenty-five citizens who certified that they had not signed the promise contained in the 37th Rule had "boarded, it is thought, nearly all the students who have boarded out in private families." This is untrue. The list included several who had never boarded students at all, and leaves out many who had.

I never made it a point to preserve papers of this kind, because the end of the term ended the use and object of the certificate. But in looking into a drawer in the President's room, where loose papers were sometimes laid

aside, I found *thirteen* certificates, given in accordance with the 37th Rule, and the name of only one of their signers is found among the twenty-five, who are said to have taken, "it is thought," "nearly all the boarders." These I now have.

3. As Mr. Allen has stated the case, the reader is led to conclude that the 37th Rule had been in the catalogue for three years. But it had never been drawn up in form and put in the Catalogue until the College year previous to June, 1857, when Mr. Allen's "documents" bear date, that is, at most, only a year and two terms, instead of three years. While it was a verbal rule, we accepted verbal assurances of its fulfilment; when reduced to a written form, that form, or its equivalent, was expected. The earliest written certificates under the printed rule, were in 1856.

4. But to show the "total depravity" of the statement in Mr. Allen's book, p. 222, which proposes to give the signatures of those who had not signed the certificate, I now remark that I have spent a few hours in calling upon my more immediate neighbors, and have obtained a positive denial of what is there stated, from each individual on whom I have called. The following are samples:

"Mr. Allen's book, p. 222, purports to have the signature of my husband, Mr. Robert Edmunds, to a paper about boarders. At the time that paper bears date, he had been dead several months. Neither he nor I ever signed any such paper, or authorised any one to do so. His name was falsely used. Mr. Doherty called on us with the certificate. WEALTHY EDMUNDS."

"Previous to June, 1857, I never had a student of Antioch College as a boarder in my family. A. H. PLATT."

"I did comply with the 37th Rule in the College Catalogue about boarders. I never objected to it. It was a

just and proper rule. I never signed my name to any paper like that contained in Mr. Allen's Book, p. 222, nor authorized any one to sign for me. The whole story is a fabrication of Mr. Allen, or of some one else, adopted by him.

SNOW RICHARDSON."

"This is to certify that previous to June, 1857, I had no boarders in my family from the College, and that any use of my name, to the effect that I was in any condition to be at all implicated by such a state of facts, is altogether unwarrantable, and without any basis of truth.

WM. MILLS."

"Since June, 1857, I have had some boarders, and have complied with the rule, and deem it both wholesome for the students and their friends.

WM. MILLS."

"I never signed the paper, nor authorized my name to be placed on any such paper as appears on page 222 of Mr. Allen's Book. I had complied with the College regulations in regard to boarders, and always approved them.

J. D. NORMANDIE."

I have other certificates and denials, to the same effect; but are not these sufficient to show the fraud and mendacity of Mr. Allen in this matter? Several of the persons whose names are in that list have left town, and others are dead. Such are the ones, (like Mr. Edmunds,) whose names he would be likely to use without authority.

5. When a written certificate was first required, it was thought that, perhaps, individuals might object to signing such a paper, because it might expose them to the ill-will of their boarders. In order, therefore, to introduce the rule as quietly as possible, I suggested that different members of the Faculty should take prepared certificates to persons whose intimacy they enjoyed, and obviate any objections they might entertain. Mr. Dougherty, (as appears by Mrs. Edmund's certificate above,) took some of them, Mr. Allen others, &c. Now, if any

person did *not* sign said certificate, might it not be those whom Mr. Allen was deputed to visit, and whom he tampered with and allowed to escape, and whose cases he now brings forward to inculcate me? He expressly excludes the Spring term of 1857, after the administration of the rule had fallen exclusively into my hands.

But I weary of my task. The sun sets, but the work is not done. The multitude of falsehoods contained in the book defies refutation, and transgression outruns punishment. Before me, and both on my right hand, and on my left, vistas of lies stretch away in endless perspective. I loathe and abominate them all, but must leave them to perish, as venomous insects perish on the banks of the Ganges or the Nile. Truth imposes no severer labor upon a man, than to expose the falsehoods of his fellow-man. I have done my part of this painful work. My regard for Antioch College, and for the noble principles it embodies and exemplifies, has prompted me to this irksome task, and sustained me in its performance. That object accomplished, I leave the book to the oblivion, and its author to the retribution which respectively await them. Would God that an early repentance and reformation on his part, might hasten the one and supersede the other.

HORACE MANN.

Yellow Springs, June, 1859.


MR. CRAIG'S STATEMENT.

[It is proper to say, as an introduction to this article, that it was first published as an *advertisement*, in the columns of the *Gospel Herald*, the organ of the Christian denomination in the West, April 20th, 1859. This paper was, at that time, published by John Geary & Son, of Columbus, O., who were also the publishers of Mr. Allen's book. The columns of the paper, under the editorship of Mr. Geary, had for several months been loaded with articles from Mr. Allen, and his co-actors, lauding him and his book, and denouncing Antioch College, and all connected with it, or friendly to it. Column after column was filled every week in that manner. Mr. Craig prepared this article, written in the kindest spirit, and wrote to Mr. Geary inquiring if an article of this kind could be admitted to his columns, either as a communication or as an advertisement; and if only as an advertisement, at how much per page. His first letter brought no answer. To the second Mr. G. replied that it could be admitted *as an advertisement, at twenty dollars per page!*

An impartial public will ask, why should so many articles on one side of such a subject be published without charge, while a single article on the other side is charged as an advertisement? That is a question for Messrs. Geary & Allen to answer.

But Mr. Craig accepted the proposal, and sent on his article. An arrangement was made for Geary's bill to

be paid at Yellow Springs, and he was notified accordingly. The article was sent April 15th; on the 16th, which must have been as soon as it was received, and before it was published, Geary & Son wrote to Bro. Craig, "We shall have your article in next issue of the Herald; in the meantime you will please send us by express the \$20." On the 21st, still several days before the paper had been received, they sent a bill to me also. As it happened, one of Mr. Craig's creditors, learning of the transaction, wished to make an arrangement to have the money paid to him, to be passed to Geary's credit, and I delayed a little to know whether that could be done. On the 26th they sent another bill to me by mail, and one by express, with orders to the agent to collect immediately, or return the bill. This bill was as follows:

"A. Craig	Dr.
To John Geary & Son.	
For publishing letter,	\$27,00
For 10 papers,	50
 For postage,	10
	\$27,60"

Soon after, business called me to Dayton, where I learned, by accident, from a letter of Bro. Craig's to Bro. John Ellis, that the money had already been sent by Mr. Craig; but Geary did not notify me, or the Express Agent of this payment until, after waiting several days, I wrote to him about it myself. On the 30th Geary & Son wrote again to Mr. Craig, that the proposal to settle with his creditor did not suit them, and requesting that the money be remitted by "return mail." The money had been sent a week before this letter was received.

Now it is pertinent to ask, why were these bills sent in both directions? Why this haste to "collect immediately?" Why did he not, when he had received the money, notify me, or countermand his orders to the Express Agent to collect immediately? Why did he leave it to a mere accident for me to learn that the money was paid? Business men will judge.

Of the same spirit as this was his sending to parties at Yellow Springs five hundred unordered copies of the sheet containing the article, with an enormous bill; and his charging \$22,50 for work which other printers have estimated to me at \$8, as their "asking price." The facts in the last case can be shown if necessary.

This is Mr. Geary, the publisher of Mr. Allen's "History." Fit publisher for fit author! *Par nobile fratrum!*

The candor and Christian spirit of this article contrasts widely with the spirit and conduct of the author and the publisher of the "History." These, of themselves, indicate strongly with whom are truth and justice, and with whom they are wanting.

For the insertion of topical headings in this article, Mr. Craig is not responsible. J. B. WESTON.]

ADVERTISEMENT.

BROTHER GEARY:—

Four months ago I procured a copy of Ira W. Allen's "History of the Rise, Difficulties and Suspension of Antioch College." Its title-page informs me that you "printed and published" the book. You have also publicly commended the book; for, over your name, the readers of the Gospel Herald have been told, week after week, that every *lover of a free and pure Christianity should obtain and read this book.*

Accordingly, I obtained and read the book. I found

it an unhappy book, Brother Geary. It seems unhappy in its spirit; it is unhappy in many of its statements. The book lacks so many of the essential requisites to History, (such as fairness, fulness, truthfulness,) that at times I have doubted whether silence were not the fittest reply to it. I knew, however, from several manifestations of bitterness which I had observed during my late sojourn at Yellow Springs, that there were some who would welcome such a book. But, Brother Geary, I would not have supposed that a respectable publisher could be found to issue such a book, and to commend it to every "lover of a free and pure Christianity." Still less would I have supposed that any respectable minister could be found, who, while virtually acknowledging his lack of all personal knowledge of the matters in controversy, would hear one side of the story, and, without awaiting the reply of the assailed parties, would straightway endorse the *ex parte* statement as genuine history, and publicly express the wish that the "History" might be widely circulated. I did not anticipate these things. They surprise me. And now, Brother Geary, I think that not silence, but refutation, is the fit reply to the mis-statements and calumnies contained in this "History." From personal knowledge, I can say that several important statements in this "History" are not true,—I will presently give the proper details.

But first, Brother Geary, I wish to tell you that it pains me to write such things as I must write about Prof. Allen's book. My first perusal of that "History" gave me very unpleasant feelings towards its author. To overcome these feelings, at least so far as to prevent my testimony from being warped by them, I have refrained from publishing this reply,—now for more than three

months. Meanwhile I have used my calmest moments in revising my manuscript, striking out whatever I thought might be harsh or unkind, and seeking to make my feelings kind and my words mild. Nearly all of the following portions of this communication have been rewritten four times. I trust it is not improper to add that, desiring to make my reply to Mr. Allen's mis-statements unobjectionable in its expressions and spirit, I sent the manuscript, a few weeks ago, to one of our oldest and most respected Christian ministers, requesting him to point out to me any passages or words which he might think objectionable on the ground of charity,—for, Brother Geary, it seems to me that the simple facts in reference to Mr. Allen's many mis-statements are so like cannon balls, that a man void of animosity might wish to wrap them well in velvet before projecting them forth.

In preparing this communication, I have tried to combine charity with truth. If I have written uncharitably, may I be forgiven! If I have failed to write according to the truth, let me be refuted.

I am ready now, Brother Geary, to proceed to the promised details relating to Mr. Allen's mis-statements.

MR. CRAIG AT ANTIOCH AS PROFESSOR OF GREEK.

On the twenty-first page of Mr. Allen's "History," it is stated that after Professor Holmes left Antioch College to go to Europe, I, [Austin Craig,] "was requested to become his substitute;" that I "declined coming that term, but would think of it;" and, that "after about five months' deliberation and preparation, Mr. Craig consented to take charge of Professor Holmes' classes, and commenced at the opening of the Fall term, September 5th, 1855."

Here, Brother Geary, before proceeding with Mr. Allen's story about my coming to Antioch, I wish to give you some additional particulars.

During several months prior to this "Sept. 5th, 1855," my health was poor. When I received the invitation to take the place of the absent Professor of Greek, I stated my fear that my health would not be sufficient to enable me to perform the duties of the post. There for a while the matter rested. Afterwards, (namely, July 2d, 1855,) at J. E. Brush's store, in New-York City, Elder Eli Fay told me that, in anticipation of my coming to Antioch, the Committee on Teachers had made no provision for instruction in Greek. My Diary, under date of July 2d, records that I "agreed to go to Antioch College and teach Greek in Holmes' place a year, if health permit." Besides this proviso about health, there was one other, *viz.*, that I could obtain the requisite leave of absence from my congregation. The congregation voted me a leave of absence from their service until the following Spring. Thus, I went to Antioch for only a part of the year, and that with the express stipulation, "if health permit." I will add that the "five months' preparation" alleged by Mr. Allen, was all made in a few hours.

On my arrival at Antioch, the three Greek classes were given into my care; I had also my full share of what Professor Allen designates as "morning chapel exercises, and other general duties of the Faculty." I had much more than my share of the Sunday "chapel exercises;" for, during my stay at Antioch, I preached in the College Chapel, and in the Christian Church, as much as I was required to preach to my own congregation at home. After some weeks of College duties, I found my health failing. President Mann pro-

cured me then an assistant, to whom for the remaining half of the term I entrusted my class in the Greek rudiments. Of this transaction, Mr. Allen's book speaks unfairly. The book says that Mr. Mann called on Mr. Burlingame, (a teacher in the "Preparatory School,") and desired him to take one of Mr. Craig's classes; which Mr. Burlingame declined. "Mr. Mann called again, but without obtaining the consent of Mr. B.; and, as the meeting of the Trustees was near at hand, the matter was *hushed*, and rested. As soon, however, as said meeting was past, and the Trustees had dispersed, Mr. Burlingame was again urged to take one of the Greek classes!" So far Mr. Allen's "History."

Now, Brother Geary, as a printer, you may correctly understand the *italicizing* of the word "hushed" in the above citation; also, the import of that mark of surprise (!) at the end of the sentence. Are they not fitted to give the impression that something was wrong in the transaction with Mr. Burlingame?—something that must not come to the ear of "the Trustees?" and so, was "*hushed*" when their meeting was "at hand," but was agitated again as soon as the Trustees were out of the way?

But, Brother Geary, there was nothing wrong or improper in the transaction with Mr. Burlingame. So far as I had any knowledge of it, it was all open and honorable. Hence, I am constrained to say that those innuendoes differ from falsehood, in about the same degree that an untruth hinted in cowering *italics*, differs from an untruth affirmed in bold Roman.

Mr. Allen continues his account of the affair by stating that "accordingly Mr. B., (Burlingame) notwith-

standing his own duties were onerous,—accommodated Mr. Craig by taking one of the Greek classes.”

Brother Geary, this statement may give you the impression that Mr. Burlingame took one of my classes *in addition to his own* “onerous” duties. That, however, was not the case. Turning to my Diary, under date of October 16th, (1855,) I copy as follows:

“Mr. Mann told me this morning that he had arranged with Mr. Burlingame to take my First Preparatory Class in Greek, (Mr. Pennell taking his in Latin,) provided I would take his (Burlingame’s) Sunday service. Agreed to.”

It was Professor Pennell that did the extra work involved in this arrangement; and he received the pay. I paid Professor Pennell for thus relieving me of one of my three classes, the third part of the sum which at that time, I was expecting to receive. And so, Mr. Burlingame, (“notwithstanding his own duties were onerous,”) merely exchanged an hour a day in Latin, for an hour a day in Greek rudiments, with the advantage in his favor of a release from his Sunday duties in the Chapel. But, Brother Geary, all these important parts of this transaction, our historian appears to have “*hushed*” “!”

Having finished his account of Mr. Mann’s calls on Mr. Burlingame, our historian philosophizes over the matter as follows:

“Now, why was Mr. Mann so much more tender of Mr. Craig than of Mr. Holmes? Was it not on account of Elder Craig’s peculiar religious or theological views?—on account of his not laying any particular stress on Church organization or Church ordinances; and thus differing from all, or nearly all, members of the Christian

Church, or connection, and from other evangelical denominations? If this was not the reason, pray what was it?"

Brother Geary, I am confident that, in a similar case, Mr. Mann would have been as tender of Brother Holmes, as of me.

HE MISREPRESENTS MR. CRAIG'S THEOLOGICAL VIEWS.

But letting this pass, I come to Mr. Allen's mis-statements about me. He alleges that "Elder Craig" has "peculiar religious or theological views," also that in some important points Elder Craig "differs from all, or nearly all, members of the Christian Church, and from other evangelical denominations." Mr. Allen alleges also, (on the eighty second page of his book,) that "Craig," and some others, "are nominally members of the Christian Church."

What must the reader think? He is informed that "Elder Craig" has "*peculiar* religious or theological views;" also, that "Elder Craig"—differs from all, or nearly all, members of the Christian Church;" that "Elder Craig" is unsound as respects "Church organization or Church ordinances;" also, that "Elder Craig" is only "*nominally*" a Christian; and, to cap the climax, that, when "Elder Craig" was once growing sick, Mr. Mann grew "*tender of*" him:—(and it is evident from "History" that Mr. Mann is the biggest Wolf that ever got into our Fold.)—Putting all these suspicious particulars together, Brother Geary, the reader's mind may be suitably prepared for the untrue allegation made in the closing paragraph of this "History," where (evidently referring to the year during which I was the college preacher,) Mr. Allen tells our brethren that the "*liberalistic theology*" was substituted at Antioch "for Christianity."

Brother Geary, I have never been connected with any denomination except the "Christians." Before I was ten years old, I became familiar with "Christian" preachers, and with "Christian" publications. I began to preach among the "Christians" before I was out of my "teens." I joined the "New Jersey Christian Conference" the 30th day of May, 1844. This Conference then accepted and commended me as a preacher of the gospel. Not long afterwards, the same Conference gave me "ordination" as a Christian minister. The ordaining committee were Elders Isaac C. Goff, Nicholas Summerbell and Charles W. Havens. I have been a member of the New Jersey Christian Conference from the day of my admission to the present time. I joined the "Christians," loving their professed principles. I remain in fellowship with them because those principles leave me free to extend equal affection and fellowship to all who sincerely love our Lord Jesus Christ. I can't imagine why Mr. Allen should write me down as only "nominally a member of the Christian Church," unless for this reason: that in a sermon preached where Mr. Allen was present, I said that the CHRISTIAN CHURCH is much larger and nobler than *The Christian Denomination*; and, that a man might profess "no creed but the Bible," and "no name but Christian," and yet be for all that, a bigot and a sectarian.

Brother Geary, I think Mr. Allen's allegation is only "nominally" true.

But, again: Mr. Allen's "History" charges me with "not laying any particular stress on Church organization, or Church ordinances." This charge is equivocal. It may be taken to mean that I do not lay "any *particular* stress"—that I do not make a *hobby* of those subjects: or it may mean that I disregard and neglect "Church ordi-

nances." If the former was Mr. Allen's meaning, I accept the compliment; if the latter, I deny the untrue charge.

Why, Brother Geary, I have enforced and administered the "Church ordinances," even in places where I was making only visits, or a short sojourn: as in Fall River, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, New Orleans. Especially where I have sustained pastoral relations to a community, have I enforced and administered the "Church ordinances." It was so in Camptown, N. J.; where once I was Elder Isaac C. Goff's colleague, during several months of his ill-health. It was so in Feltville, N. J.; where eleven years ago I was a minister in a community in which the "Church ordinances" had not been observed. In that community I administered Baptism, and introduced the commemoration of the Lord's Supper. Our first communion there had four participants; our last had thirty. It is so, also, in the community of my present charge. I could not *introduce* the observance of the Lord's Supper here, (for it was introduced a century ago; but I have urged this duty upon the people at their regular communion seasons; have appointed an extra season of communion when it seemed advisable; and have seen many communicants added to our number during my ministry here. As to the other "Church ordinance"—Baptism—I found that the people did not lay "any particular stress" upon it, when I began my ministry here: for, in its primitive form, it was not at all practised here; while in any form it seemed to be falling into disuse. At suitable times I have enforced the duty of Baptism upon this people; and, in this place, I have "buried with Christ by baptism" thirty-eight believers.

Wherefore, I certify you—brethren of the "Christian

Church, or connection"—and you, "other evangelical denominations"—and all others whom it may concern: that the "Elder Craig" mentioned in "History," *does not* misuse the ministerial office for promulgating "peculiar religious or theological views;" furthermore, that "Elder Craig" *does* revere and enforce the "Church ordinances" of our Lord Jesus Christ.

We will now resume the interrupted narrative by noting the following passage, taken from the 23d page of Mr. Allen's "History:"—

"Mr. Craig remained in Mr. Mann's family during the winter, preaching in the College Chapel a part of the time, but left in the Spring; very well satisfied, no doubt, that the post of Greek instructor in Antioch College was not the post for him."

You will remember, Brother Geary, that my congregation had given me leave of absence until "Spring." It seems to put a different face on the matter to say, "*but left in the Spring; very well satisfied, no doubt, that the post of Greek instructor was not the post for him.*" This harmless bit of "History" may "no doubt" be put in the before-mentioned fabulous "five months' preparation."

THE DEGREE D. D.

Mr. Allen devotes the ninety-second page of his book to remarks, original and selected, concerning the "Degree 'D. D.," which, he says, was conferred by Mr. Mann, and "those members under his influence or control,— upon Eld. Austin Craig!"

With this portion of "History," I find no fault. It is one of the best portions of Mr. Allen's book. The selections are choice and piquant; the spirit admirable; and the original remarks well adapted to show how the

dry details of "History" may be enlivened by a fertile fancy, and adorned by classical scholarship. To be sure, the above quotation ends with Mr. Allen's favorite figure of speech—the typographical Mark of Surprise (!); but it is quite appropriate there: for, really, it was a surprising thing—that "degree D. D.," conferred on "Eld. Austin Craig!" Indeed, I don't suppose that anybody was *more* surprised by it than "Eld. Austin Craig" himself. For my part, Brother Geary, I won't say, but it had been entirely proper if the announcement that "Eld. Austin Craig" had been expanded into a "D. D." were followed—not by *one* Mark of Surprise, but by a whole battalion of them.—Somewhat as follows:——“the degree of D. D.”——“conferred”——“upon”——“Eld. Austin Craig!” ~!!!!!! ≡!!! ¡¡¡ !!! !!

\\ !! / !-! !-! \\ ! \\ / !!!

Here, Brother Geary, I would dismiss this "D. D." matter, if Mr. Allen had not added some injurious insinuations. For instance, on the 188th page, Mr. Allen writes:

“How Brother Maple could turn such a short corner, and go over to ‘Messrs. Dean, Fay & Co.,’ —— I cannot divine, unless [they], as has been hinted, bought him off with promises of future emoluments and honors.”

“Should this ‘scheming clique’ succeed in pushing the ‘Joint Stock Company’ through, and purchasing the College, and, in the mean time, should not Elder Maple turn another ‘short corner’ and desert them, he may stand a chance of receiving a ‘D. D.’ as has Austin Craig.”

In this passage, Mr. Allen first intimates that Brother

Maple was "*bought off*" with promises of future "*honors*;" next, Mr. Allen adds, that, if Brother Maple will be faithful to those who have bought him, "*he may stand a chance of receiving a 'D. D.,' AS HAS AUSTIN CRAIG.*" From all this, the inference is easy that "*Austin Craig*" was "*bought*" with a "*D. D.*;" and if the reader be curious to learn the *price* of such "*honors*," he may find even *that* "*hinted*" on the ninety-second page, where Mr. Allen says:

"Whether he ['the Doctor'] thought that one year's service was an equivalent for the 'D. D.,' we cannot say."

About the "*equivalent*," of course, Mr. Allen "*cannot say*;" but he can "*hint*;" he can calumniate me by an innuendo, which may do as much harm as if the calumny were *said*, while it may be safer for the calumniator. Brother Geary, I should not think that these insinuations about bargaining for "*honors*," "*receiving a D. D.*," and rendering an "*equivalent*," would influence a reader's mind against me, when he reflects that the insinuator was a member of the Faculty in which "*Mr. Mann conferred the degree 'D. D.'* upon Elder Austin Craig."

Brother Geary, I aver that I never said a word, nor even "*hinted*" a hint, that could possibly be construed into a wish for Antioch "*honors*." I had no idea that any person was thinking of a "*D. D.*" in connection with my name, until the public announcement of the "*degree*" was made.

In my judgment, Mr. Allen owes it to himself (as well as to me) either to deny publicly all intention of charging me with having sought or bargained for a "*D. D.*," or else to affirm publicly, in plain words, that which he appears to imply in hints and insinuations. The latter alternative is, of course, out of the question.

I would respectfully add, that, inasmuch as Brother Geary's types were used to print untruths prejudicial to my character and ministry, and inasmuch as those types are used, week after week, to commend the book which contains those untruths, it seems to me proper and right to ask Brother Geary to publish this, my reply and defense, in the columns of the GOSPEL HERALD.

AN "EXAGGERATION."

I now proceed to give other examples of the unreliability of Mr. Allen's book.

The hundred and thirty-seventh page of "History," states that "Fay, *Craig* and Weston *zealously labored** with Elder Ellis one day last winter, and *importuned* him for permission to publish statements," [about Professor Allen.] "Finally, Craig and Weston acknowledged that they thought it might be an injudicious step."

This unreliable portion of "History" is answered by "Elder Ellis." I have a letter from Brother Ellis, dated March 24th, 1859. I transcribe the following extract:

"In reply to your inquiries, I remark, nearly as I can now recollect, that I made to the Executive Committee of the C. B. Association, in substance, about this statement, in the presence of Mr. Allen: That Elders Fay, Weston and Craig requested of me, as one of the Executive Committee, the privilege of making certain statements in the GOSPEL HERALD, together with the opportunity of presenting certain evidences concerning the conduct of Professor Allen.

* In this passage, and in subsequent ones, I have *italicised* the words to which particular attention is directed.

“I also remarked, that, after I had talked with them awhile, they seemed to think it might not be best; and, for the sake of peace, would drop it.

“It will be remembered that what I said was called out by the published report of the ‘Informal Committee;’ as I was willing Allen should have the privilege of answering that report, and had not at that time lost all confidence in him.

“That is all, Brother C., that I can recollect of the affair at present. *I have no hesitation in saying that Allen has given an EXAGGERATED version of the matter in his book.*”

Brother Geary, I, too, “have no hesitation in saying that Mr. Allen has given an *exaggerated* version of the matter.” For, that I “*zealously labored* with Elder Ellis, and *importuned* him,” is not true. In giving that “*exaggerated version of the matter,*” Mr. Allen has afforded another illustration of the old story of the “*three black crows,*” amplified out of “*something as black as a crow.*”

But, Brother Geary, this is not the only passage in Mr. Allen’s “History” which gives “an exaggerated version” of matters. A spirit of exaggeration is manifest in several portions of the book. The tendency to exaggerate becomes strong when the feelings are much excited: Mr. Allen’s book abounds with proofs of having been written in a very excited state of mind. Persons speaking or writing under the influence of highly excited feelings, lose the poise of their judgment; make inaccurate statements; and adopt worthless authorities. Still more excited, they forget what is due to their own dignity, or to the obvious proprieties of speech, and indulge in abusive epithets, and unmeasured terms of contempt.

"HISTORY"-CAL STYLE!

Brother Geary, the paragraph which here follows will not be pleasant reading. It consists of quotations from Mr. Allen's book, and will illustrate what I have written in the paragraph immediately preceding this. The quotations are carefully copied from Mr. Allen's "History," beginning with the "Preface."

The "History" tells us of Horace Mann's "cruelty"—"venomed javelins"—"spies"—"fiendish act;" calls him "a modern Jeffrey," and charges him with "most despicable injustice."

Speaking of a "Report" made in the Gospel Herald, by a committee composed of Elders Reeder, McWhinney and Wait, the "History" says that "a more thoroughly reckless and blackly false article probably never appeared in print!" "Fay & Co. had breathed into him (Elder Maple) their poisonous breath." Referring to Elder Fay's published "Explanation," Mr. Allen tells us that "such a fool-hardy, reckless, slanderous article never met my eye in any political newspaper. I know not how the most practiced villain, the most venomous defamer could crowd more lies into the same space." Of Mr. Fay's "note" to Mr. Allen, we are told that "only a blind, vile, most bitter partizan feeling could have given birth" to it. "History" tells us also how Fay "flattered and hoodwinked McWhinney until the encrustations of soft solder became so thick that he (McW.) could not see out." We are told that Eli Fay is "the merest tool of Horace Mann, and religiously, perhaps, several points below Theodore Parkerism!" "The mendacious Eli!" "Mr. Mann's base quizzing and crafty wire-working." "The notorious, mercurial Rev. Eli

Incognito, and another eccentric gentleman." "Long-faced cunning, and sanctimonious chicanery." Referring to Mr. Mann's absence from the late "Stafford Convention," Mr. Allen says: "The grand divertisement would have been still more magnificent, had *His Serene Highness* condescended to be present! But, as it turned out, *his marshals* were adequate to the occasion." "Mr. Mann's heroes at Stafford"—"Mr. Mann's puppets"—"Mr. McWhinney, who, perhaps, has bowed with greater humility to kiss Horace Mann's great toe, than did ever priest before the Roman Pontiff's."

Such, Brother Geary, are the epithets with which Mr. Allen's "History" abounds. They indicate a highly excited and bitter state of mind—a state of mind which disqualifies its possessor for writing sober and reliable history. I discover evidences of Mr. Allen's excited state of mind in other passages—as where Mr. Allen goes out of his way to bring in something that has no connection with this topic. For instance, on page 142, Mr. Allen replies to a certain statement concerning Mr. Allen's relation to Mr. Mann's "hospitalities," as follows:

"As to 'hospitalities,' I have never experienced them very frequently, (not at all since Mrs. Mann published her 'religious cook-book!') nor extensively," etc.

Now, Brother Geary, this clause in the brackets has not the slightest bearing upon the point which Mr. Allen is professedly making. Why then did he introduce it? I suppose that he introduced it to cast a slur upon "Mrs. Mann." Examine the clause, Brother Geary. You find the words "religious cook-book!" enclosed in quotation-marks (" "); thereby giving a reader the impression that this is *the title* of a book published by Mrs. Mann. You observe also Mr. Allen's favorite mark of exclamation (!),

as if Mr. Allen would intimate his astonishment at the idea of a "*religious cook-book!*" A copy of the book to which Mr. Allen refers is before me. On the back of the volume, I find the words "Mrs. Horace Mann's Cook-Book;" on the outside of the cover, "Mrs. Horace Mann's Health and Economy in Cooking;" on the title-page, in large letters, "A Physiological Cook-Book." Neither cover, title-page, nor preface shows me the words "*religious cook-book!*" Mr. Allen's reference to this book is, first, entirely unnecessary; second, it gives an untrue impression; third, it betrays an excited state of mind; for who but a highly excited historian would introduce such a trifle for the sake of expressing his typographical astonishment? "Straws," they say, "show which way the wind blows." The very typography of Mr. Allen's "History" shows that the book was not written in a calm mood. Many sentences of the book bristle with exclamation-marks (!). Indeed, from the passage where Mr. Allen records his arrival at Antioch College, on to the end of his "History," (namely from page 9 to page 240,) there are not two dozen pages of Mr. Allen's own writing which do not contain from one to seven marks of astonishment. I count this fact, Brother Geary, among the corroborations of the statement that Mr. Allen's book abounds with marks of having been written in an excited state of mind.

HIS AUTHORITATIVE—"IT IS SAID," &c.

But further: A highly excited state of mind would naturally induce a historian to rely upon insufficient authorities in matters wherein their statements correspond with the historian's feeling. A calm, impartial historian weighs his authorities, and rejects [mere rumor and hear-

say. I wish to show you, Brother Geary, the character of some of the authorities, on which Mr. Allen relies in support of some of his matters of "History."

I select half-a-dozen instances: giving, first, Mr. Allen's statement; and, next, the historical authority on which he grounds it.

(1.) Mr. Allen's statement, that Brother Maple was "bought off with promises of future emoluments and honors."—Mr. Allen's historical authority—" *It has been hinted.*"—"History," page 188.)

(2.) Mr. Allen's statement, that "Dr. Warriner connected himself with the Christian Church of Cincinnati, in accordance with Mr. Mann's advice, a short time before his name was laid before the Trustees for a Professorship!" On this, Mr. Allen observes—"There are not many men, it is to be hoped, who would connect themselves with a Church for the sake of a Professorship!" Mr. Allen's historical authority: "*It is said.*"—"History," page 9.)

[Brother Geary, don't be surprised if hereafter you should learn that Dr. Warriner's "short time *before* was sometime *after* "!"]

(3.) Mr. Allen's historical statement, that "Mr. Mann has often found it convenient to screen his acts under the expression, 'The Faculty desires,' &c., 'The Faculty has decided,' &c."—"History," page 18.)—Mr. Allen's historical authority: "*It is said.*"

[Remark.—Mr. Allen was a member of that "Faculty" four years. Now, if he had ever *known* such an instance as he reports from hearsay, he should have said so. If, however, he never knew such an instance, then how can we believe that "Mr. Mann has *often* done so?"

Brother Geary, I knew of no such instance occurring

during my stay at Antioch in 1855-6. And during the last College-year, I knew of Mr. Mann's putting himself to trouble several times to see members of the Faculty about little matters which I would have thought it proper for him to have determined at once. I think that Mr. Mann was scrupulously careful *not to say* what Mr. Allen says "it is said" he would say.]

(4.) Mr. Allen's historical statement, that "a lady student called on Mr. Mann more than a year since to obtain an honorable dismissal to attend another Institution. He could not give her such a dismissal, because 'she had attended one of his Saturday evening parties (for students) without an invitation!' when the invitation had been given out publicly in the chapel, as usual, to all the students!"

Mr. Allen's historical authority for this ridiculous story, is appropriate: "*It is said.*"—("History," p. 142.)

(5.) Mr. Allen's historical statement, that "*Eli Fay was as black-hearted a man as ever breathed.*" Mr. Allen's historical authority: "*A responsible and influential man TOLD ME a few days since, that he HE BELIEVED it.*" ("History," page 231.)

[Remark.—Brother Geary, just think of *Cain* and *Herod* and *Judas* and *Nero* [not to mention other "black-hearted" men,] and then think of an "influential man" becoming "responsible" for such a speech! I do not question the fact that somebody "*told*" Mr. Allen those bitter words; for men with diseased livers may be found even in Ohio; but it is strange that a historian should deem Jaundice—historical authority.]

(6.) Of the same worthless, hearsay character is Mr. Allen's authority for the following statement:

"*Reliable people have told me things concerning Mr.*

Maple's former character and course of life, which I could hardly believe, even after the transactions of the past twelve months."—"History," page 233.)

But, there is no need of multiplying instances of this kind. What historical authorities they are! "*Reliable people have told me.*"—"It is said."—"It has been hinted."—"A responsible and influential man told me that he believed," &c.

Such authorities, Brother Geary, are not in repute with calm and judicious historians. They were unworthy of Mr. Allen's notice. And if Mr. Allen had been calm and unexcited when he was writing his "History," I think he would have left all such authorities where they fitly belong—to gossips and backbiters.

Brother Geary, let us pass on to another topic. I wish to call your attention to some passages in Mr. Allen's "History," which have not even a poor *hearsay* to support them, but rest solely upon *insinuations*.

One example of this kind we have had already. I refer to the passage where Mr. Allen says—"Whether he ["the Doctor,"] thought that one year's service was an equivalent for the 'D. D,' we cannot say."

Having already answered the calumnious innuendo contained in this and its related passages, I will here only say that this passage affords a fair example of the way that Mr. Allen insinuates grave charges by a hint, or by an artfully framed question, which leaves the bad meaning in the mind of the reader, while it does not seem to commit the writer to the responsibility of having *said* it.

Let me give you some additional instances:—Take the following passage, from the sixty-second page of Mr. Allen's book. The passage begins appropriately with

one of our historian's favorite authorities — "*It was said.*"

"Indeed it was said—that Eli Fay had been chiefly instrumental in appointing "Mr. Dean agent, and giving him a written contract for the Eastern territory and the *sixteen per cent.* What share of the profits Mr. Fay was to have, *we do not know.*"

In this passage enough is said to convey the impression that something dishonest was done by Mr. Fay. And yet, the passage is so worded that, should Mr. Allen ever be called to an account for his insinuations of dishonesty, he would be able to answer that he has not *said* there was any dishonesty. And, truly, he has *not* said it. What he *has* said is, that he does "*not know.*"

Take another instance:—On the two hundred and twenty-sixth page of his "History," Mr. Allen notices a certain "brief card;" concerning which, he says:

"This card was signed by Mr. Mann, and Messrs. Harlan and Mills; *and what deception Mr. Mann practised on these gentlemen in order to induce them to sign said card, WE DO NOT KNOW.*"

This passage insinuates that "deception" *was* "practised on these gentlemen" by "Mr. Mann." However, Mr. Allen ingenuously says, "*we do not know.*" *Not know!* Then why *insinuate?* It appears from the "History" that Mr. Allen was on visiting terms with Lawyer Harlan and Judge Mills; thirty minutes was sufficient to take Mr. Allen from his own door to the door of either of "these gentlemen;" moreover, Mr. Allen, in the "Preface" to his "History," assures the reader that his book is "no *ignus fatuus,*" as he has "*given much time to the examination of records and statements.*" Now, Brother Geary, on the supposition that Mr. Allen has "given

much time" (or, indeed, *any time*,) to the "examination" of this "card," by going to his neighbors Harlan and Mills to get "statements" from them relative to the insinuated "deception practised on these gentlemen" by "Mr. Mann;" how shall we understand Mr. Allen's statement he does "not know?" Mr. Allen may have had the best of reasons for *not knowing*: but then, what reason had he for *insinuating*?

But, Brother Geary, in some passages of his "History," Mr. Allen insinuates the bad meaning without putting into the paragraph a confession of his ignorance: as where he makes charges, under cover of asking questions.

Take one or two examples:—

On the two hundred and first page of his "History," accounting for Brother Maple's favor towards the "Joint Stock Company," Mr. Allen queries as follows:—

"Did the advocates of said plan offer him some shares in the proposed Company, a 'D. D.,' or a future Chaplaincy in the College, if he would lend his services and the columns of the HERALD, to drive the plan through? We hope that no such advances were made; and if made, we trust that they were not accepted. But why this sudden transition from hate to love?"

Brother Geary, whether any "such advances were made" to Brother Maple, I "do not know." Certainly, we all "*hope* that no such advances were made; and *if made*, we trust that they were not accepted. *But*"—But what?

Brother Geary, our historian cautiously refrains from *saying* anything positive, while all the while he is artfully insinuating the thing. If Mr. Allen *knew* that any such "offer" was made to Brother Maple, he might have

stated his knowledge; if, however, he *he did not know*, he might properly have withheld his insinuation:—especially as he was writing a “History,” whose boast is that it is “*A Collection of FACTS.*”

Take another example.—On the forty-eighth page of this “History,” referring to something written by Mr. Fay in defence of the College Agents, Mr. Allen puts the following questions:—

“Why is Mr. Fay so very sensitive about the agents? Is it because a part of the large per-centage which he was instrumental in according to A. S. Dean, went into his own pocket?”

The way that our historian puts these questions is likely to give readers the impression that Mr. Fay had entered into some sort of conspiracy with a College Agent, and had divided spoils with him. However, here as elsewhere, Mr. Allen does not “say” the thing. And yet, should he be charged with constructing these questions so as to yield his readers the ready inference that Mr. Fay was guilty of dishonesty; I see not how Mr. Allen could answer the charge better than by this answer, which he says he once made to Professor Warriner: “Well, Mr. Warriner, I wish you to understand that ——— — I do not consider myself responsible for all the *suppositions* and *inferences* of people.” (“History,” page 150.)

King Charles the Second once asked the Royal Society, Why a vessel of water receives no addition to its weight by a dead fish being put into it. When, however, it was found on trial that the dead fish really added its own weight to the vessel of water which received it; the Royal Quibbler could have answered that he had not *said* it did not, and that he did not consider himself responsible for all the *inferences* of people.

But, Mr. Allen is “responsible for the inferences of people,” whenever he so frames his sentences that his readers must inevitably infer some untruth. Of such sort is an instance on the two hundred and thirteenth page of his “History;” where Mr. Allen writes that Mr. Mann “seems to find it quite a tax *to read a prayer* occasionally in the *College Chapel!*”

ABOUT READING PRAYERS.

Now, Brother Geary, let us draw some “inferences.” But, first, I wish to tell you that, in this sentence, Mr. Allen *italicizes* the words, “*to read a prayer,*” and the words, “*College Chapel.*” (Italics, you know, are used to mark emphasis, and to call particular attention.) Observe, furthermore, that at the end of the sentence, Mr. Allen places his favorite typographical figure of speech,—the mark of surprise (!); indicating that there is something surprising in the sentence,—(and, verily, there is “!”)

Once more, Brother Geary, let us carefully note Mr. Allen’s sentence: “He [Horace Mann] seems to find it quite a tax *to read a prayer* occasionally in the “*College Chapel!*”

Now for the “inferences.” First, from the italicizing of the words “*College Chapel,*” I infer that the historian meant to give the impression that Mr. Mann never prays anywhere else, (and even there only “occasionally.”) Secondly, from the *italicizing* of the words “*to read a prayer,*” I infer that the historian meant his readers to get the impression that whenever Mr. Mann “occasionally” prays in the “College Chapel,” he “*reads a prayer.*” I think, Brother Geary, that Mr. Allen is “responsible

for" this "inference;" and, if so, he is responsible for the *falsehood* which it contains.

Brother Geary, I regularly attended the Chapel services of Antioch College during several months of the College-year 1855-6. At that time there was an arrangement, according to which each of the Professors, in rotation, preached in the College Chapel twice on Sunday, and led the devotions in the Chapel during the week following. Mr. Mann took his "turn" with the others. Again, I regularly attended the Chapel services during the three terms of the College-year 1857--8. During those terms, the week-day Chapel services were generally conducted by Brother Weston and myself. Mr. Mann, however, offered morning prayers during several weeks of that year. Moreover, at my request, Mr. Mann has sometimes offered the opening or closing prayer at the preaching services in the College Chapel. And, Brother Geary, I never but once knew Mr. Mann "*to read a prayer;*" and that was not "in the *College Chapel,*" but in the "Christian Church" of Yellow Springs, when (at its dedication,) he read as a Scripture lesson, Solomon's Prayer at the dedication of the Temple.

That is what I know of the matter. However, if we may credit "History," Mr. Mann "seems to find it quite a tax *to read a prayer* occasionally, in the *College Chapel!*" The mark of surprise with which Mr. Allen emphasizes this one of his "Facts," is surprisingly appropriate.

"READING CIRCLES."

The final paragraph of Mr. Allen's "History" is a fitting close to such a book. I subjoin the paragraph entire, *italics* and all:

“May our brethren not only look well to their educational interests, but also be very vigilant of their religious rights and immunities. May they not, on the one hand, be narrow minded, nor cling with a blind tenacity to rites and doctrines simply because they are hoary with age; nor on the other, may they be charmed by new ‘isms’ simply because they are new and specious; nor be led astray by such recent Antioch renovations as the substitution of *reading circles* for Sabbath evening prayer-meeting, and the *liberalistic theology* for Christianity; but may they pursue the *golden mean*, the path of heavenly wisdom, the *narrow way* that leadeth unto life eternal.”

In this paragraph, Brother Geary, pious exhortations are combined with deceptive and slanderous statements. For, subtracting from the paragraph that portion which may be called pious exhortation, there will remain the allegation of “such recent Antioch renovations, as the substitution of *reading circles* for Sabbath evening prayer-meetings, and the *liberalistic theology* for Christianity;” in which allegation, the first charge is deceptive, and the second slanderous.

Brother Geary, I think it properly falls to me to expose these charges; because I initiated those “*reading circles*,” and I was the College preacher during the last College-year.

Let me tell you, Brother Geary, *how* those “reading circles” came to be substituted “for Sabbath evening prayer-meetings,” also *what* those “reading circles” were.

Those “Sabbath evening prayer-meetings” were rarely attended by more than twelve or fifteen students. Sabbath evening, January 17th, 1858, [only six students being present,] I proposed a plan for interesting a larger number of students in a Sabbath evening religious-meet-

ing. Briefly this: to remove from the sombre school-room, to the pleasant parlors in "Ladies' Hall," and to invite all the students to meet us there for religious reading and conversation. The plan included also singing and prayer.

We agreed to try the experiment. Accordingly, on Sunday evening, January 31, I gave the invitation to the students at their tea-table, where about half of the whole number were assembled. This was nearly one hour before the time appointed for the "reading circle." At the appointed time, about a hundred persons [most of them students,] assembled. I read to them the 5th, 6th and 7th chapters of that devout and inspiring book, Sears' "*Foregleams of Immortality*." I risk nothing in saying that "every lover of a free and pure Christianity," might do well to "obtain and read *this* book." The reading received marked attention, and an animated conversation on the subjects of the chapters followed. The meeting closed with a hymn. The success of this experiment was so evident, that we deemed it best to continue the "reading circles." We had four other "reading circles" that term. The attendance ranged from fifty to about a hundred. These were the subjects of our readings: "Death," "The Resurrection," "The Organic Connection of the Present and the Future Life," "The Soul's Home," "The Heavenly Peace," "The Judgment Day," "Christ as the Judge," and "The Glorified Saviour,"—all from the "*Foregleams*."

At the beginning of the next term, we tried the prayer-meetings again, but concluded to return to the "reading circles." So, Sunday evening, April 25th, found us once more in the parlors, with between fifty and sixty hearers, to whom some pages were read out of Sears'

book on "Regeneration." All but one of the remaining Sunday evenings of that term, we met in the same place, having good attendance and excellent attention. We read and conversed about "The Natural Man," "Hereditary Corruption," "The Adam of St. Paul," "The Holy Spirit," "Regeneration," "Choice," "Conflict and Victory," "The Mediator," &c. One evening we read from "The Eclipse of Faith," the chapter entitled, "The Blank Bible." Our last "reading circle" was held Sunday evening, June 27th, just before the close of that College-year. It was attended by nearly sixty. We had singing at those "reading circles," Brother Geary, in which many joined. We used as our singing book that excellent collection of our Eastern brethren—"The Christian Harp." I can even now, almost hear the touching tones of that sweet hymn, "*Jesus died on Calvary's mountain.*" We sang it more than once. We had prayer, too, at those "reading circles," Brother Geary. They were not "substituted for Sabbath evening prayer-meetings," in order to get rid of prayer! Brother Geary, we believed that they would prove promotive of the interests of the "prayer-meetings." Accordingly, I hear without surprise, that at the present time "the Sabbath evening prayer-meetings" held at Antioch College are very well attended. The average attendance at these "reading circles," was five times greater than that at the "Sabbath evening prayer-meetings."

I appeal to you, therefore, Brother Geary, whether our well-meant efforts to interest the students in the most sacred themes deserved any such deceptive and ungenerous slur as that where Mr. Allen expresses the hope that "our brethren" may not "be led astray by such recent

Antioch renovations, as the substitution of *reading circles* for Sabbath-evening prayer-meetings."

One word more on this topic. Strictly speaking, the "reading circles" were not a "recent Antioch renovation," for more than three years before the first Sabbath-evening "reading circle,"—namely, Sunday Sept. 23, 1855, I attended two Sabbath-day "reading circles," held in the Chapel of Antioch College. It was the only time that I ever knew Prof. Ira W. Allen, personally, to take his "turn" in preaching to the students. That Sunday, [whether it was then a "recent Antioch renovation" or not, I "do not know,"]—but that Sunday, Professor Allen "substituted" for the customary preaching, the *reading* of two Unitarian sermons; one by Channing, and the other by Samuel Osgood. *And, excellent sermons they were; and very well read by Professor Allen.*

"LIBERALISTIC THEOLOGY" AT ANTIOCH.

I pass now to the second charge in Mr. Allen's alleged "recent Antioch renovations,"—namely, "the substitution of the *liberalistic theology* for Christianity."

This, Brother Geary, is the most injurious charge that could be made to "our brethren" against Antioch College.

Brother Geary, *the charge is not true.*

What are we to understand by "*liberalistic theology*?" Mr. Allen defines the term, by way of synonyme, on the forty-first page of his book. He there states that "the liberalistic [Theodore Parker] leaven is slowly but surely leavening the whole mass" at Antioch. From this I infer that by "*liberalistic theology*" Mr. Allen means Theodore Parkerism.

And who is chargeable with this "recent Antioch renovation"—this "substitution of" *Theodore Parkerism*

“for Christianity.” Of course, the odium must fall on the College preacher, and “Elder Austin Craig” was the preacher at Antioch last College-year. The same “Elder Craig,” concerning whom Mr. Allen [on the ninety-second page of his “History,”] quotes an anonymous newspaper scribbler as saying, that “according to the symptoms indicated by the papers, our divinity was sick at Yellow Springs,” and “*the doctor has gone to its relief.*”

Indeed! And pray, what was the result of “the doctor’s” visit?—did he renovate the “sick divinity?” *Renovate it!* (some reader of history may exclaim) truly, he *did* renovate it, with a vengeance! for Prof. Allen’s book tells us of “recent Antioch renovation,” one of which was “the substitution of the *liberalistic theology* for Christianity.”

And, Brother Geary, there are other things in Mr. Allen’s book, collateral to these, which a reader will be likely to think of. For instance; the reader finds it stated that Horace Mann was urgent in getting Mr. Fay adopted by the Christian Church in Yellow Springs, as pastor:—the same Elder Fay, whom Mr. Allen declares to be “religiously, perhaps, several points below Theodore Parkerism.” If, then, Mr. Mann was so anxious to have a Parkerite pastor of the Christian Church in Yellow Springs; much more anxious might he well be to have a Parkerite preacher in his own College-chapel.—Perhaps, therefore, the reader may draw an “inference” when he reads in Mr. Allen’s book that “*Mr. Mann was much pleased with Eld. Austin Craig’s religious opinions, and had desired ever since the College opened, to get him into Antioch as an instructor.*”—I think the reader *must* draw an “inference” from this: for, when the read-

er reflects that last year "Elder Austin Craig" was at "Antioch as instructor;" he may remember that last year also "the liberalistic (Theodore Parker) leaven" was "slowly but surely leavening the whole mass." And, when the reader further reflects that, last year "Elder Austin Craig" was the College-preacher also; he may then be ready to infer that this fact accounts for the alleged "substitution of the *liberalistic theology* for Christianity."

But, Brother Geary, all this network of suggestions and hints is a tissue of untruth: for "the liberalistic theology" ["Theodore Parkerism"] was *not* substituted for Christianity at Antioch last year. I, who was the preacher at Antioch last year, say that I know of *no* "substitution for Christianity" made at Antioch last year.

Brother Geary, I arrived at Antioch last year, one month after the College year began. From the time of my arrival until the end of the College-year, I preached all the sermons that were heard at Antioch, except seven; most of these seven being preached by visiting ministers of various denominations.

SKETCH OF A SERMON PREACHED AT ANTIOCH.

I had prepared a list of the texts and topics of my Antioch sermons of the last College-year, meaning to add them to this communication; but the length of the communication seemed to demand their omission. I accordingly content myself with giving you a sketch of my introductory sermon. It was preached, Sunday, Oct. 11, 1857. As I knew that the College-preaching would fall to my lot during the year, I purposely initiated my ministrations with an explicit declaration of my faith and

doctrine, unwilling to have “the trumpet give an *uncertain* sound.”

My text was from “First Corinthians;” fifteenth chapter; first, second, third and fourth verses. I laid emphasis upon the following words:—

The gospel—by which ye are saved,—first of all—that Christ died for our sins,—and that he was buried, and that he rose again—according to the scriptures.

I proceed, Brother Geary, to give you a sketch of the “Theodore Parkerism” that was “substituted for Christianity” on that occasion.

The preacher’s first point was, that, according to Paul, the “Gospel” is not a natural, human *Discovery*, for the Improvement of Mankind; but is a supernatural, divine *Revelation*, for the Salvation of Mankind.

Second point:—that the marrow and life of the “Gospel” is CHRIST;—not a system of Theological Ideas, nor a Code of Ecclesiastical Polity; but an incarnated Divine Person, containing and expressing “all the fulness of the Godhead,” and therefrom filling all things.—Take Christ out of the Gospel, and you leave it meaningless and unprofitable. “*Without me, you can do nothing.*”

Third point:—that Christ is related to Mankind as “Wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption,” chiefly through those three cardinal facts of the Gospel, his Death, Burial and Resurrection. Furthermore, that the Death of Christ (though accomplished “by wicked hands”) was foreordained by the Father; since He “died for our sins—*according to the Scriptures;*” that is, according to the purpose of God foretold by His prophets. Moreover, that the Death of Christ is God’s special testimony concerning the Enormity of Sin, and His su-

preme Displeasure against sin; though, at the same time, the Death of Christ is a special token of God's Love to the Sinner. So that the Blood of Christ is the one foundation of Evangelical Conviction of Sin and Assurance of Pardon.

The import of the Burial of Christ; I may here omit.

The Resurrection of Christ may be viewed, first, as his Visible Return from the Dead. Thus viewed, Christ's Resurrection is God's miraculous attestation to the truth of Christ's testimony, and to the divineness of his mission. But, secondly, we may consider the Resurrection of Christ as initiating and involving that entire series of divine outpourings of truth and energy and love, connected with our Justification, and issuing from His Glorification when he passed through the heavens to the right-hand of God, where now he ever liveth to make intercession for us, and to organize and renew the things in heaven and the things in earth, and the things under the earth, until the last enemy be put under his feet, and God be all in all.

You have here, Brother Geary, an outline of the first sermon that I preached at Antioch last College-year. At the close of such a sermon it was not improper to enforce the simple gospel "by which we are saved," with the Apostle's own warning:—"Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached, let him be anathama!"

I preached in Antioch Chapel last College-year, twenty-eight sermons. I *preached* no little at the "Sabbath evening reading circles." I delivered thirty-seven lectures to the Senior class on the Evidences of Christianity—several of which lectures needed only a text to have

made them sermons *in form*. Besides, I held meetings several Sunday mornings with a class in the Greek New Testament; reading to them and expounding portions of the Gospel of St. John. All of these preachings and teachings, I believe to have been in doctrinal harmony with the sketch of my first sermon above given. The remaining religious teachings at Antioch College during the last College-year were those connected with the Sunday afternoon Bible-Class and the Sunday evening Prayer-meeting: but as both these had been in existence for years, and were conducted last year substantially as before, Mr. Allen's charge of "*recent renovations*" cannot be understood of them. *That charge, Brother Geary, implicates the College preachers of last year, and is—as you have seen—utterly groundless.*

Brother Geary, my unpleasant duty is performed. I have given you my testimony relative to such portions of this "History" as I have personal knowledge of. I have added to this some criticism upon the spirit and general execution of the work. Beyond this, I have not tried to go. I have not said, Brother Geary, that the book does not contain many true and important statements respecting the history of Antioch College. I have not said that the conduct of Antioch affairs (especially its *financial* affairs,) has been what it should have been. The spirit which prevailed among us so extensively when we were building the "great Antioch College" has worked out its appropriate result. "He that exalteth himself shall be" —*assigned!* We will try to learn humility from the Providential lesson. Furthermore, Brother Geary, I have not said that Mr. Allen was not an able and acceptable instructor in the College. Of his *book*, I

have said that as a fair history of Antioch College, I can not receive it: I am sorry to have had such severe things to say about it.

And now, Brother Geary, (if it might be permitted me to say so much,) I would like to tell the author of this "History" that I cherish no ill will towards him: and that I think he will hereafter see cause to modify the statements and expressions of several portions of his book. I trust it will not seem invidious also to say that errors originating in an intense excitement of the feelings, or an excessive zeal, are not to be judged with too much severity in a young man of great natural force and energy. When Saint Augustine was in the ripeness of his age, he published a volume of "Retractions," taking back those things which he had rashly written in his immature years. The Christian world applauds the "Retractions" of Augustine.

Brother Geary, farewell,

AUSTIN CRAIG.

Blooming Grove, N. Y., April 13, 1859.

MR. WESTON'S STATEMENT.

To those who know me I need not say how reluctant I am to engage in a discussion of a personal nature. My maxim has always been to say nothing derogatory to the character of anyone, unless some good purpose demanded it. And now, although my name has been dragged before the public and wanton and unprovoked attacks made upon it, I would willingly bear it in silence, knowing that the slanderer's course is short, and that all the time the bitterness is in his own bosom, were it not that in this case, the interests of the Christian denomination, and of Antioch College, either of which are far dearer to me than my own, were primarily aimed at and made to suffer by these slanders. For the sake of these higher interests, therefore, I propose to make a few statements to the public respecting matters alluded to in I. W. Allen's book, which he calls "A History of the Rise, Difficulties, and Suspension of Antioch College." I propose to give a plain narrative of facts and convictions, as they came to my knowledge, or forced themselves upon my mind, and thereby show the reason of the conclusions to which I have been led.

But whatever I say, I shall endeavor to say in a spirit of Christian candor: for I have no disposition to descend to the low innuendoes with which his book abounds.

COMING TO ANTIOCH.

It is known to those who know me, that I came to Antioch College at a mature age, having already been several years in public life; at an age when most persons would have thought themselves too old to commence a Collegiate course. I had, for some years, had a deep and personal interest in the public affairs of the Christian denomination. I took an early part in the movement in behalf of the College, was a member of the "Marion Convention" where its erection was determined on, and was, for nearly a year, its agent in New England.

So I came to the College in Nov. 1853, about one month after it opened, with a deeper interest in it, its principles, and the denomination which founded it, than belonged to a student merely. In December, I entered its most advanced class—then Freshmen. Throughout my Collegiate course, though not officious in College affairs, I was not ignorant or careless of what pertained to its well-being. I had an outside knowledge of many of the difficulties which arose, though I was never made acquainted with the deep-laid plans of mischief, developed in the unmasking of Ira W. Allen, which his recent course has necessitated.

Besides being a student, I taught a class in the Institution every term I was here, except one. I knew of the jealousies which existed among some of the teachers, (fostered chiefly, as I now believe, by Mr. Allen,) and of the charges against Mr. Mann, of local and denominational partiality. In his book the author seeks to make the impression that I was a large participant in these jealousies and charges; but it is not so. No person ever heard me say that I believed Mr. Mann to possess or to

indicate any prejudice against any teacher on account of his or her denominational relations. I always averred the contrary, as Elder D. P. Pike, who was one of the Trustees, and an intimate personal friend, as well as others to whom I expressed my conviction, can testify. With some of those who entertained such feelings, I was on friendly terms; and when I expressed to them that I met none of the prejudices of which they complained, I was told, "You are only a student now, and have but one class; so you do not meet it. But when you are once graduated, if you should become a candidate for a place here, you would fare no better than the rest of us; you would find what we say to be true." I never went out of my way, during my course, to court the favor of Mr. Mann, or any one else. I have never wavered in my firm adhesion to the Christian denomination and its interests, and to what I believe to be the spirit, principles and measures which belong to New Testament piety. And my appointment upon the Faculty, unsolicited as it was by me, either directly or indirectly, by word or act, and which was brought about chiefly through the instrumentality of Mr. Mann, I consider a complete refutation of the charges which were made.

GRADUATION,—PLANS FOR THE FUTURE.

I finished my collegiate course and graduated July 1, 1857; just at the time of the assignment of the College property. My intention had been to spend a year or two more, at least, in studies in some other institution. With this intention I had declined offers much more favorable, in every worldly view, than any position in Antioch College which I might expect. From my fourteenth year, I have devoted my life, however imperfectly,

to God and to the Christian denomination. To furnish myself the better for my work, I had given four years to study here, and, for the same purpose, I intended to spend additional time elsewhere. And nothing but an imperious conviction of duty, supported by the advice of wise and judicious friends, could have induced me to forego that intention.

But the assignment, which was advised and approved by the wisest and best friends of the Institution and of the denomination, placed its affairs in a new position. The property must be sold to satisfy the claims against it, and the only hope lay in the formation of a new Corporation, to buy it when sold, and to continue the Institution, without any material change in its original spirit and purpose.

FALSE AND UNJUST CHARGES UPON THE ASSIGNORS.

This assignment is made a special object of attack, through labyrinth of pages in our author's "History." He calls it "the wily scheme of a designing man, or clique;" says that its intention was "to take Antioch College from its *denominational basis*," "to exclude from the Board of Instruction, Prof. Doherty, Holmes, [but Holmes was reappointed] ALLEN, and all other true representatives of the Christians," &c.

Now, who are the men who are hereby maligned? who were the *dramatis personæ* of this "one act of Mr. Mann's drama?" The committee who unanimously recommended the assignment, were Messrs. F. A. Palmer, D. P. Pike, H. W. Bellows, William Mills and John Phillips. A foremost stab, then, falls, among others, upon Elder D. P. Pike, of Mass., a man of sound discretion, and a man than whom one of firmer moral and denominational

integrity does not live. Mr. Allen himself, when it suits his purpose, lavishes on him a profusion of maudlin encomiums ; but, here, when the contrary suits him better, he does not hesitate, by implication, to make him the victim of this secret and felonious thrust. Certainly, from the friendship which he has shown to Mr. Allen, Mr. Pike deserved better treatment at his hands. But friend and foe are sacrificed with equal cold-bloodedness upon the altar of his selfishness.

Not only upon these men does this blow fall, but also upon the other Trustees who voted for the assignment, of whom were Elders Amasa Stanton, J. C. Burghdurf, Eli Fay, and Messrs. John Kershner, J. P. Corey, W. R. King, James Maxwell and Samuel Stafford, all men of long standing in our membership, and whose fidelity is shown by their works. What have these men done to merit his malediction ?

What does our author mean to say? that these men were originally all knaves or fools? or that they were be-knaved or be-fooled for the time being by Mr. Mann? If the latter, why does not the charm break from some of them, so that they can tell by what process of incantation they were played upon ?

The truth is, that that assignment was recommended and approved by the best of men, and for the best of motives, and Mr. Allen knew it. It is an after-thought of his false-heartedness, when he saw that by this occasion "his sin had found him out," that he thus turns around and condemns it and them.]

ARRANGEMENTS FOR CONTINUING THE SCHOOL.

With the expectation of the accomplishment of the above-named result, the Trustees took steps at the same time to have the educational work of the College contin-

ue, though the property was in the hands of an Assignee. The assignment was deemed to have put an end to the relations existing between the Trustees and the Faculty, and measures were taken to organize a new Faculty for the ensuing year—believing that within that time, arrangements could be made for the transfer of the College to the new corporation. Mr. Mann was invited, by vote of the Trustees, to resume his position as President, and Hon. Aaron Harlan, Rev. Dr. Bellows, and Elder Eli Fay, were appointed a Committee to secure a corps of Professors.

Among the Trustees present at that session was Elder D. P. Pike of Newburyport, Mass., between whom and myself a firm and constant friendship has existed since our first acquaintance in 1843. As usual, while here he made his home with me; and we had frequent conversations on the condition and prospects of the College and its relations to the denomination. He stopped some days after the commencement, and was consulted by Mr. Fay respecting the appointments to be made upon the Faculty. It was desired to retain the old members as far as could consistently be done. But over eighty, among the best students of the College had expressed, in a written remonstrance, their decided dissatisfaction with the Professor of Rhetoric, Rev. W. H. Doherty, and it was deemed impolitic to re-appoint him against so strong a demonstration. Professors Warriner and Cary, who had made themselves respected by all, both for their ability as teachers and their character as gentlemen, and against whom no party had breathed a suspicion, it was thought should be retained, of course. As to Professor Allen, I knew that by many of the students he was deemed a good man for his department, and by many

others he was much disliked. I knew, too, that his feeling toward Mr. Mann and Mrs. Dean were by no means cordial and friendly; though *they had never said anything to me in any way prejudicial to him*. From his representation, however, I had been led to believe that they were really unfriendly to him; perhaps unjustly so. Between him and Professors Warriner and Cary, I had no reason to believe that any other than the most friendly relations existed. I was greatly surprised, therefore, to learn from Elder Fay, in a conversation with Elder Pike, that when these men were asked to resume their position as members of the Faculty, they utterly refused, if Prof. Allen was also to be retained. They said that he had manifested such a character and disposition during their acquaintance with him, that they would never consent to become members of a Faculty of which he was also one. Had such an announcement come, in the first instance, from Mr. Mann or Mrs. Dean, I might have been led to attribute it to an unjust feeling of personal hostility to Mr. Allen; but, coming from Professor Warriner and Cary, whose candor and impartiality had never been called in question, even by those who were on the sharpest scent for any delinquencies in that direction, I could not but believe that there was some good cause; though, what it was, as yet, I had no means of knowing. It was thus early seen that the probabilities were strong against either Professor Doherty or Allen's being retained.

Professor Holmes was then in Europe; but was designing, as I knew, to return in season for the commencement of the Fall Term, and resume his Chair as Professor of Greek, for which he had been for over two years devoting himself to earnest study, under the best German Professors. Elder Pike inquired of Mr. Fay, if Profes-

sor Holmes would be retained in his place. Mr Fay said he had had no consultation with the committee on that point. So far as he was concerned, it would be desirable. He did not *know* how Mr. Mann would feel about it, but he thought there would be no objection. Mr. Pike afterwards saw Mr. Mann, and, in conversation on the subject, Mr. Mann said that he not only did not object, but, on his part he should be *very desirous*, to have Professor Holmes resume his Chair. A few days afterward Mr. Mann expressed the same to me.

Subsequently, Mr. Pike hinted to me, that he thought that I should have an invitation to take the place which some had wished me to take, the year before, viz: the Principalship of the Preparatory Department. He knew my plans and purposes. I asked him whether on condition that Professors Doherty and Allen should *not* be re-appointed, and Professor Holmes *should be*—he would advise me to accept an appointment if one should be offered me. *He advised me to accept it.*

As the opening of the College for the succeeding year, depended on the raising of money to meet its annual expenses, no appointment of Teachers could be made except contingently upon the same conditions: which conditions, however, all had confidence would be fulfilled. Before Elder Pike left, enough was known of the wishes of all concerned to decide that Professor Holmes was unanimously desired to resume his Chair; and Mr. Pike was requested by Mr. Fay of the committee, and by Mr. Mann, to meet Prof. Holmes immediately on his landing in Boston, and acquaint him with the state of the College affairs, and convey to him their desire for him still to constitute one of the Faculty.

About a week after Elder Pike left, I also was to leave

to spend the summer with my friends in New-England. In the meantime I was called on by Elder Fay, and requested to take the position to which Elder Pike had alluded; subject, of course, to the above-named contingency of raising funds. In view of the circumstances of the College; knowing what had been done in the case of Professor Holmes, the enjoyment of whose companionship would be a consideration which I should highly prize; and, knowing, too, his own intention to return to his Chair; and also, having had beforehand the advice of one in whom I had great confidence; I agreed to take the place, if the committee should see fit to appoint me. No formal appointments were yet made, except that of Mr. Mann, who had been chosen by the Trustees.

[PROFESSOR HOLMES' DESIGN TO RETURN TO ANTIOCH.

I have said, I *knew* Professor Holmes was designing to return. Mr. Allen and some of his correspondents insinuate the contrary. Mr. Allen speaks [p. 154] of my accepting the appointment when I had "good reason to believe that Prof. Doherty, Holmes * * nor Allen, would have anything to do with said school." One of his satellites, who echoes what he has told him and then is rewarded by having his echo printed in the book; and whose friendship for Professor Holmes, has been seen in nothing but *in helping Mr. Allen in an underhanded manner to the unjust data* which he made use of to the damage of Professor Holmes at the time of his leaving for Europe, and in the high-sounding words of false pretense in which he sings the Tenor to Allen's Bass; this man whom Mr. Allen calls "Professor (!!) H. D. Burlingame," says in a letter to me on this point after a large quantity of equally false allegations: "knowing, as you

did, that Professor Holmes had said repeatedly, that he would never again occupy his Chair in the Faculty unless Mrs. Holmes was restored to her place, * * * * there must have been more faith than reason in your expectation of Professor Holmes' society."

Knowing, as I do, both from my own knowledge and from the corroborative testimony of other unimpeachable witnesses, including Professor Holmes and Mrs. Holmes themselves, the two-faced part which Allen and Burlingame acted, toward Professor Holmes in the difficulties which he met here in the Spring of 1855; how can I be otherwise than disgusted and impatient with their fulsome and hypocritical laudation:—disgusted at their voluntary praises, (for which *I know* Professor Holmes does not thank them,) when, at a time when they thought their purposes of self-promotion would be better served by a contrary course, they did not hesitate to seek, by secret and unjust measures, to injure him in the minds of Faculty, Trustees and students.

But, to their allegations. *I did know* that Professor Holmes was designing to return to Antioch. *I knew it from his own letters to me.* Mr. Burlingame doubtless makes his allegation on the authority of Mr. Allen, which is worse than *no authority*. But the fraternal relations and intercourse, between Professor Holmes and myself which have continued, uninterrupted and unabated, from the time of the Marion Convention till now, (Allen & Co's despicable attempt to effect the contrary notwithstanding,) were such as to make our correspondence, during his residence in Europe, intimate, frequent and confidential; as much so, I presume, as he had with any one in America. I knew his employment and his plans. But assertions, such as are alleged by Mr. Burlingame,

he never made to me. On the contrary, in a letter from Berlin, dated July 3d, 1856,—the letter which gives information of the safe arrival of Mrs. Holmes, and their journey from England to Berlin—he says, “*I have no intention of forsaking Antioch yet.*” Similar to this was the tone of all his letters. From Geneva, April 10th, 1857, in answer to what I had written him of my own plans for future study, to which I have before alluded, he writes:

“Your plans. I hope sincerely that Providence may so order it that you shall remain at the Springs at least another year. *I shall value your presence and co-operation much.* * * * I think also that Antioch needs you.” These expressions were voluntary. I had intimated no such hope or opinion.

From Geneva, June 1st, 1857, only one month before the time of our Commencement, he wrote to me about some arrangements for his passage home—expressing his desire to have me meet him in Boston, and stating some of his plans for his journey to Yellow Springs. This letter I received a very few days before the time when this matter of accepting a place here, was presented to my mind. He says:

“It appears to me now that if I sail [from Liverpool] Aug. 8th, I shall reach Boston so as to spend Sabbath, 23d, there, reach Ann Arbor [Mich., the home of his parents] 26th, remain there until Sept. 1st, then repair to the Springs in time to put my room in order and be *on hand* at the opening of the term, Sept. 9th. These are my plans, now make yours accordingly. * * * * I feel quite anxious that you should remain at Antioch, I think that is the field for you; but Heaven knows better than I do. Look there for light.”

[Since the above was in type, I have received a note from Bro. Holmes, dated Portsmouth, N. H., June 20, 1859, in which he says, "I am free to admit to you and to proclaim to all men, that up to the day of my landing in Boston, Aug. 13th, 1857, I had no other intention or expectation than that of resuming my labors in Antioch College at the opening of the next term."]

I might give many more such extracts, but these are sufficient to show whether or not I was justified in expecting to enjoy the companionship of Professor Holmes, and to show how much ground Messrs. Allen & Co. have for their slangish imputations to the contrary. They show, too, how much these self-elected champions really knew of Professor Holmes and his plans, and how far he thought them worthy of his confidence.

"But Heaven knows better than I do. Look there for light." There spoke Br. Holmes. There is his spirit of Christian submission and faith in God. With such a man there is an atmosphere which it is wholesome to breath:—one's spirit is made stronger and purer by it. But I will not speak his praise. He does not ask it nor need it. Still, one cannot turn from the contemplation of such a character as I. W. Allen's to such a one as that of Thomas Holmes, without wishing to stop a while and enjoy the relief.

His advice corresponded with my own feelings. If I ever "looked to Heaven for light" in any matter of my life, I did and have in respect to my relations to Antioch College. And every new unfolding of Providence, either in my private and family exeperiences or in public affairs, convinces me more and more that I have not misjudged. To have fallen under the ban, and to have been made the victim of the misrepresentations of a man like

I. W. Allen, is a million times outweighed by the privilege of being one of the number who have borne the burden of toil, of self-denial, of contumely and misrepresentation, which was necessary to carry Antioch College through its two years of straits and difficulties, and of seeing it triumphant over the desperate and determined opposition raised by him and his co-adjutors, and secured to its original founders to carry out its original spirit and purpose.]

ALLEN WOULD HAVE BEEN GLAD TO ACCEPT AN APPOINTMENT.

On the evening before I left for New England, Mr. Allen called on me to inquire if I knew whether anything was determined on by the Committee in his case. As no action had at that time been taken, I could give him no light. He appeared very anxious to find out, either directly or indirectly, whether he was to be re-appointed or not. He spoke of what he considered the improbability of the re-appointment either of Prof. Doherty or Holmes. I asked him (and I had a personal motive in asking) whether, if he should be re-appointed to his place and Professors Doherty and Holmes should not—he should accept the appointment. He replied that he had previously thought he should not: but, since Prof. Doherty had expressed to him that he [Doherty] should accept a re-appointment if tendered to him, whether he (Allen) was re-appointed or not, he thought *it would be right for him to accept it if it should be tendered to him.*

Mr. Allen remembered this conversation when I referred him to it during the winter following.

My friends may be assured, that to see myself charg-

ed with denominational delinquency for accepting my appointment, expecting on good grounds to be associated with Prof. Holmes, and not knowing—however much I might suspect it—that there would be any other change in the Faculty than his return and my appointment would necessitate; and to see that charge made by a man who declared to me that he thought it would be right for him to accept a place, though he *knew* that neither “Prof. Doherty, Mc Kinney, Burlingame, Holmes,” Weston nor any other one of the old teachers or new ones of those whom he calls, *par excellence*, the representatives of the Christian denomination, would have a place with him,—is to me one of the most striking exhibitions of the difference which selfishness makes between *meum* and *tuum*.

I went to Maine, enjoying on my way, pleasant visits with my old and tried friends Elders Edmunds of Boston, and Pike, of Newburyport. But before I left I was charged by Mr. Fay and Mr. Mann to urge Elder Pike not to fail to meet Prof. Holmes in Boston, and to communicate to him their desires.

HE IS NOT RE-APPOINTED AND SWEARS VENGEANCE.

Mr. Allen, after his earnest importunities of the Committee, learned that they declined to re-appoint him. He learned also of their action in the cause of Prof. Holmes and myself. Revenge was, then, evidently determined on. A. M. Merrifield was here and entered into his plans. They were proclaimed so loud that it came to the ears of the members of my family who were here, that A. and M. were going East, and were going to meet Prof. Holmes when he landed in Boston, and prevent him and myself from returning to the College. The

object was to keep us from the College, to repudiate Mr. Mann, and others of the Faculty who belonged to the Christian Church, and to raise the cry that the Christian denomination had no part or lot in Antioch College.

Early in August I received a letter from Mr. Fay informing me that I had been appointed by the Committee to the position in the new Faculty, which had been proposed to me before leaving Ohio; adding that the money to meet the annual expenses was not fully raised, though they had no doubt it would be, and that, if the term opened, I should be depended on. I answered, accepting the appointment, but aware of the contingency.

I soon had a letter from Mr. Allen, expressing a remarkable interest in my welfare, and inviting me to meet him in Lowell, Mass., and be ready with him to meet Prof. Holmes on his arrival in Boston. He also made some serious complaints about the turn affairs were taking at Antioch, and told me what were "Br. Merrifield's" views respecting the Presidency.

About the same time I also received a letter from Elder Pike, from which I learned that Mr. Allen had been writing to him and soon would make him a visit. He had learned that Messrs. Doherty and Allen were not re-appointed, and that "the pot had begun to boil;" and he intimated that Bro. Edmunds of Boston, and some others of the New England friends "did not like the appearance of things." I answered, expressing my views in the matter—my confidence in the plans in behalf of the College proposed at Yellow Springs, at the time of the Trustees' meeting, and my conviction of the importance of adhering to Antioch.

My arrangement with Mr. Holmes had been to meet him in Boston and spend as much time with him there

as possible. We supposed, when this arrangement was made that that would be the only time I should have to spend with him for a long period; as he was expecting to return to Antioch, and I to spend the year in New England. He had said, too, that he could not delay to visit Newburyport or Portsmouth, but must hasten to Michigan to visit his parents and sister before coming to Yellow Springs. After my purpose had been changed I still designed to meet him in Boston; but when the time for his arrival approached, finding that it would take much of the time which I wished to spend with my friends in Maine, and supposing I should see him daily after my return to Yellow Springs, I decided not to go, but I wrote him a long letter, which I supposed he would get on his arrival. I also wrote to Bro. Pike that I could not go and that he must meet him without fail.

PROF. HOLMES ARRIVES IN BOSTON—FALLS INTO THE HANDS OF ALLEN.

Prof. Holmes arrived in Boston, Aug. 13, 1857. Bro. Pike, though in the city and seeking for him, failed to meet him. Mr. H. did not call at the post-office, and so did not receive my letter. The telegraph made known his whereabouts, and invited him to Newburyport. He went, and there met Mr. Allen. Here he heard Allen's story, and his only. Matters were represented to him as it might be expected that I. W. Allen would represent them when bent on preventing him from returning to Antioch. Mr. A. was now, of course, very demonstrative in his pretensions to disinterestedness and personal regard, and Bro. H. was led to put some confidence in what he said. He gave up his design of going directly to his father's, and visited Portsmouth, N. H. Here he met

his old and warm-hearted friends, with whom he had lived and preached for three years, and met the converts with whom he had prayed and wept and rejoiced. It was like the return of a beloved father or brother to the bosom of his family. The Church had been for some time destitute of a pastor. They had also sold their house, and had no suitable place of worship. The question of life and death stared them in the face. If they could secure the services of Bro. Holmes, they might recover themselves, build a house and establish themselves on a firm footing. They invited him to become their pastor. The appeal was strong. He foresaw that war was determined on Antioch, and that Allen was determined, if possible, to make the war denominational. Real difficulties, and unreal bug-bears of Allen's invention were presented to his mind. "He thought he should enjoy his labors better in another place." He saw the state of affairs at Portsmouth. There were large "opportunities for usefulness." He decided not to come to Antioch, but to go to Portsmouth. Thus, one object of Mr. Allen's visit to New England was accomplished.

Bro. Holmes still remains at Portsmouth, having seen much of the work of God, and having rendered efficient service to our educational interests in New England. But he remains a fast and true friend of Antioch College, of the Christian denomination, and of President Mann, as his correspondence shows, and as was especially shown by his eloquent and effective speech on these topics, at the Quadrennial Convention in New-York City.

A little later I had another letter from Elder Pike, written, I think, while Allen was at his house. This letter indicated that Allen was making considerable impression upon his mind. He gave an opinion that the

New-England Christians would turn their attention to their own school, and urged me to be at the meeting of the Bond-signers and friends of Education in Haverhill, Mass., on the 25th of August.

As this is the only letter which I received from a minister in which particular mention was made of my accepting a place on the College Faculty, I suppose it is to this that Allen refers when he says of me, [page 154] "He yielded and accepted contrary to the strong written advice of, at least, one of our most influential ministers."

But this letter *contains no such advice*; intimates no such thing. It is in my possession and will show for itself. I never had a letter from anybody that did give such advice, except from I. W. Allen. This letter was, doubtless, read to him by Bro. Pike before it was sent to me. He knew what it contained. Why did he falsify it? In the absence of conscience, he should be more cautious about his statements.

I replied to this letter in the same tenor as before, expressing my conviction that our only hope of denominational success educationally, lay in Antioch College; that if we divided on that, it would be impossible to unite in another general movement, and that although the sympathy of some might be drawn off by disaffection, still, at the worst, it had a stronger and more general hold of the hearts of our people than any other institution ever could. All my convictions confirmed the policy of the measures proposed at Yellow Springs in July, and nothing had since transpired to warrant a change in the views of any one, except the non-re-appointment of Profs. Doherty and Allen, in full view of the strong probabilities of which these measures were proposed and assented to.

On the 21st of August, Mr. Allen wrote to me from Lowell, as follows, except the italics :

“FRIEND WESTON:—

I thought when I left Yellow Springs that I should have the pleasure of meeting you ere this date ; but you have not been in this vicinity, and the expense to Skowhegan and back being some \$10 or \$12, has prevented me from extending my trip so far to the N. E.”

[He never intimated to me before leaving Yellow Springs, an intention of going to Maine to visit me. What had awakened in him this new interest in me? The facts above mentioned and the remainder of his letter will show.]

“I hope, however, to meet you at Haverhill next week. Can you not come down on Monday to Haverhill or to Newburyport, and then over to Haverhill by the morning train of Tuesday, so that we can have *an opportunity of canvassing matters a little before meeting opens?*”

“From your last letter to Elder Pike, you seem inclined to go back to Antioch! probably from the fact that you do not know all that has transpired of late at Yellow Springs.

“Profs. Holmes and Doherty and myself will not, probably, return to Antioch, and we all hope you will not. [Did he not *know* in respect to Doherty and himself? Why say “probably,” then?] We don’t wish to have any connection with the concern, unless it can fulfil the original design of its founders, and we hope you have the same spirit ; indeed, I know you have, or will have when you learn the present attitude of affairs.

“Do not fail to be at Haverhill on Tuesday. * * *

“Truly, yours,

[Signed,]

“ALLEN.”

The only material change in the attitude of affairs at Yellow Springs since I left, was the making certain of what was then highly probable, namely: that Messrs. Doherty and Allen would not be re-appointed.

This letter shows that having succeeded in inducing Prof. Holmes not to return to Antioch, he was proceeding to the accomplishment of his next purpose, namely: to induce me not to return. It shows, also, that he had a plot, by canvassing matters beforehand, to carry the friends of education in New England with him, and divorce them from Antioch. Into this plot he was anxious to draw me early.

If I had believed that Antioch College would not fulfil the original design of its founders, I would have had nothing to do with it; but believing that it would do this, at least, far more nearly than it could be done elsewhere, his letter did not seriously impress me.

THE HAVERHILL MEETING—ITS ATTEMPTS AND RESULTS.

On the 25th of August I went to Haverhill to attend the meeting referred to. I there met Prof. Holmes with his warm hand and true heart. I learned that he had not received notice of his re-appointment to his Chair of Greek. [I afterwards learned the fact that the Committee notified him of his appointment, by letter, as soon as they heard that he had arrived in America; but, as he was travelling, he failed to receive it. They would have telegraphed to him if they had known where a message could reach him. As it was, he received no notice of the fact until his arrival in Yellow Springs.] I also met Mr. Allen and Mr. A. M. Merrifield. The meeting was not numerously attended, but several of the influential ministers and friends in New England were present.

On arriving in town I met for the first time the frightful stories of the irreligious influence of Mr. Mann and the College—of the infidelity of Mr. Fay, and of the ruinous division which was alleged to exist in the Church in Yellow Springs on his account. I was surprised and astonished at such reports, and did not know what to make of them. They were as new to me as to the people at Haverhill. Friends who had heard them came to me to inquire if they were true. I replied that I did not know what might have transpired at Yellow Springs since I left, for I had no correspondence from there respecting such matters, but that there was no indication of that kind when I left. As to the influence of the College, although there, as every where else in this world of worldliness, the things of the soul, of eternity, and of God did not command the hearts of men as I could wish, yet I had no reason to believe, and did not believe, that its influence or that of its President was at all such as was represented. And as to Mr. Fay, his preaching and his relations with the Church, I knew that just before I left the Church and congregation had expressed their satisfaction with him by voting for his settlement as permanent pastor, with only three dissenting votes; and those, as one of the persons said, not from any objection to Mr. Fay pastor, but to the manner in which the vote was taken.

But I was told that Prof. Allen had recently come from Yellow Springs and said that these things were really so. I could not deny it, for his knowledge was later than mine: I could only say that it was inconsistent with what I knew when I left.

I also met the story that many of the students had become infidels while at College. This, too, was new to me, but I did not know for certainty what facts might have

come to the knowledge of members of the Faculty, and I could only say that if such was the case it was unbeknown to me; and I could not believe it.

I was also told that our people in Ohio were greatly incensed at the spirit and management of the College, and that Elder Maple had come out, or was going to come out in the Gospel Herald, denouncing and disfellowshipping the whole concern: ~~and~~ that an article, or material for one, had been furnished him from Yellow Springs, and he was going to use it. This, I suppose, referred to the article in the Herald of August 13th, 1857, which we had not then seen. I did not learn of him who had furnished the said article or material, but I have since learned from Elder Maple, that the article itself, just as it was published, with the exception of a single sentence, was written by Prof. W. H. Doherty.

This article makes especial complaint of the College for antagonism to "religious power" and "vital piety." And yet the writer of it, during the four years he was a member of the Faculty, *was not, to my knowledge, present at a College prayer meeting in one single instance!* This fact can be substantiated by all who attended those meetings.

That Prof. Allen gave me this information is proof that he was acquainted beforehand with the article, its contents and its author; and yet he says [p. 79.] that after a certain conversation with Mr. Harlan, he knew "nothing further of the intentions of the Committee until the following editorial, by *Eld. James Maple!* [referring to the same article], appeared in the Gospel Herald of August 13th."

I found, also, on arriving at Haverhill, that matters had been "canvassed," and that plans were laid to furnish

a place for me, more profitable pecuniarily, or more according to my preferences than to return to Antioch. One was, to make such pecuniary arrangements as would enable me, without embarrassment, to prosecute my former intention of studying a while longer; another was, for me to take the Principalship of the Andover [N. H.] Institute. The former proposition was the most grateful to my feelings that any could be; and were I not under obligations to return to Antioch, I would have been glad to accept it, and I so expressed myself.

The meeting opened. The bond-signers were informed that by the assignment of Antioch College property they were released from any obligation to pay their subscriptions, and it was now an open question what should be done with them and with the money which had already been paid. It could be recalled; it could be reserved to assist in the re-purchase of the Antioch property of the Assignee, if that should ever be done; or it could be devoted to the support of a denominational school in New England. This brought up the merits of Antioch College for discussion. The stories which I had heard before were repeated. Mr. Allen was active, but evidently felt that he had done the most of his work by "canvassing" beforehand. The positive assertions respecting the irreligious and sceptical influence of the College, I did not know what to think of. They were contrary to any facts which had come to my knowledge, but I had been only a student and acquainted chiefly with my own class, and I did not feel warranted in denying alone the assertions of one who had been a Professor, and who averred that facts and names could be given to substantiate them. Pending this discussion, Prof. Holmes and I by mutual suggestion left the house. Our first inquiry of each oth-

er was, what was the ground of these statements? On comparing what we each of us knew and believed, we concluded that these stories were at the least highly exaggerated; that they misrepresented Mr. Mann and the College, and that it was proper for us to go into the meeting and say so. We returned with that intention, but the discussion on that subject had closed. We did, however, take opportunities to express this our conviction to the men who were there.

The result of this discussion was a resolution to recommend the subscribers and donors to devote their money to the Andover Institute. I was then requested to take the Principalship of that school, and to preach to it and to the church. I was assured that if I would accept that position a salary of one thousand dollars would be secured for me. This was four hundred dollars more than I had any assurance I should receive at Antioch, and five hundred more than I actually did receive, although my salary was put upon the same footing as that of the other Professors.

It was proposed, also, that if I preferred to prosecute my studies still further, I could be absent from the school a considerable portion of the year for that purpose. I felt a deep interest in the success of a good school in New England, such as the friends proposed to establish. The interests of our people evidently demanded it. But I felt myself conscientiously bound by my obligations to Antioch College, and could not feel myself free to enter into any other.

My statement was sufficient for all but Mr. Allen. He was unwilling to have me leave the place without making some engagement which would prevent my returning to Antioch. He urged that inasmuch as the

Committee were under no obligation to me, except on condition that money was raised to open the school, so I was under no obligation to them, until I knew that condition to be fulfilled. He urged again, that I could tell them that I had an offer four hundred dollars better than any assurances I had had from them, and I could not be expected to remain at Antioch at so great a sacrifice. And besides, I might plead that when I accepted the proposal, the expectation that Prof. Holmes would be with me, was a strong consideration which influenced me to accept it, and now, as he was not going to return, that consideration was taken away, and I might feel myself released on that ground.

His assertion, p. 154, that I accepted the place, "having good reason to believe that Prof. Holmes would have nothing to do with said school," is in direct contradiction to the fact which he had made use of to dissuade me from returning. Of course he must have known that assertion to be false. But his memory is short where it is convenient to forget.

All these were urged by him with the pertinacity of one who is bent on accomplishing an object, and will not give it up until the last hope fails. I explained, in turn, that I had given my pledge without naming any of those conditions; and I felt myself bound, as a Christian and a man of honor, to abide by it. Besides, the time for the opening of the term was at hand; and if I should do as he desired, the Committee could not receive the notice in season to engage another man in my place. But he still urged, and said he did not see in all this, any reason why I should feel myself conscientiously bound to return. At last, when I was about to leave, he followed me into the street, and expressed his extreme regret that

I did not yield to the offers which were made, and said it would injure me very much in the opinion of my friends if I should return to Antioch; they could not look upon me again as they did before. For this insinuation I did not thank him. The suggestion was demeaning both to myself, and my friends. As though I could be diverted from what I felt myself conscientiously bound to do, by the opinions of any who could think the less of me for doing it; and as though my friends were such that conscientious action would forfeit their esteem. But subsequent experience showed me that "my friends," in this case, meant only himself. He also said, during the meeting, that the managers at Antioch would not wish me to remain; that some man less denominational would be preferred. My reply was that I had no desire to remain if I was not wanted; and, if on my return to Yellow Springs, they were willing to release me from my engagement, I would very gladly accept it, and return to New England and study; and at a proper time, I would take the place which the friends in New England desired, if it was thought best. With this understanding I left.

Mr. Allen says in his book, that "my firmness is small," and intimates that I have pursued a "venal course." Of this, those who know me must be the judges. I claim no special virtues. But if I am such a person, Mr. Allen is not the man to say so; for venality and a lack of firmness are the very things which in this case would have served his turn. He appealed to them strongly, but he did not find me sufficiently lacking in firmness, vacillating, or venal to answer his end. Hence I am made the victim of his wrath.

The meeting adjourned. Its resolutions were published, together with some commendatory articles, which

Mr. Allen has been careful to preserve and copy into his book. But the donors did not respond to the suggestion that was made. They paid their money for Antioch, and did not wish it diverted. The New England friends are determined to establish a Literary and Biblical School, and are working for it with good prospect of success. But after the presence and immediate influence of Mr. Allen was withdrawn, the facts in the case became so far known, that the very men who recommended giving the money to Andover, have paid it toward the recent redemption of Antioch; and they now rejoice with us that the work is done, to defeat which Mr. Allen has expended his energies. But to record such facts does not come within the province of his "History."

RETURN TO OHIO.—INTERVIEW WITH MR. HOLMES.

September 4th, I returned to Yellow Springs. At Xenia I met Bro. Holmes. He had come to Ohio before me, and had attended the session of the Miami Conference. From him I learned of the state of feeling which existed, caused by the allegations made against Mr. Mann, Mr. Fay, and the management of the College. He sympathized with it, at that time, to some extent; but intimated plainly that he had much more confidence in Mr. Mann than in Prof. Allen. In respect to the charges made against Mr. Mann, that his influence fostered infidelity, Mr. H. said he had expressed himself, and was willing to be known as believing that Mr. Mann's influence did not encourage infidelity, but that, on the other hand, it was calculated to check it. And, furthermore, said he, "I am willing to say that *I do not know the man in the United States who, I think, will do so much to check the tendencies to scepticism in the minds of the young,*

as *Mr. Mann*; although, in direct effort, for the conversion of men, there are those who, I think, would do more than he."

At this time he told me the ground of his conviction that Mr. Allen used his influence against him at the time of his asking leave of absence. This I will refer to in another place. But the facts then stated by him, coinciding with some things which I knew myself, and with others which I had learned from Prof. C. S. Pennell, convinced me conclusively that Mrs. Holmes was correct when she early averred that Mr. Allen had acted such a part, and that I was incorrect when I disagreed with her in that opinion.

I came to Yellow Springs determined to keep aloof from the controversy, and, if possible, to get released from my engagement, and return to New England and study. I expressed my desire strongly to Elder Fay. He objected, but said he would consult Mr. Harlan and Mr. Mann. He did so; but their reply was, that the thing was not to be thought of. So I decided to remain. And though I have been subjected to contumely and misrepresentation on account of it, as well as to hard work, I have never for a moment regretted my decision.

GOSPEL HERALD ARTICLES.

Here I met the *Gospel Herald*, which I had not seen during my absence, and saw the vials of bitterness which were poured out in its columns. Statements were made, adverse to the character of the College, which I knew to be untrue. The editorial of August 13th, for which Mr. Doherty is responsible, contained such statements. So did another article, written by Jesse Jacobs. Other correspondents, believing these false statements, were also

reiterating them, and speaking of "fallen Antioch." "Let it go." "Let it be buried." In the Herald of Sept. 17, was an article, signed "Pickaway," written, as I learn, by the publisher, Mr. John Geary, afterwards the publisher of Mr. Allen's book. It began thus:

"EDITOR OF THE HERALD:

In a late number of your very excellent paper, I read with astonishment and dismay that all members of the Christian denomination had been excluded from the Faculty at Antioch College."

Now this was widely, shockingly and damagingly false; whether the writer knew it or not. I do not accuse him. And, what was my duty? I had been here for four years. I knew the facts in all these cases. This was known to many in different parts of the country, and my statement would have some weight. Should I hold fast to my determined neutrality, so far as to let these slanderous falsehoods go uncorrected; or should I candidly state the simple facts in the case? By the former course I should be, as it seemed to me, a tacit participant in the falsehoods. By the latter I should ally myself to no party, but merely give to the public the knowledge which they ought to possess. I chose the latter course. I could do no less. I wrote an article stating, in the most candid manner, and without reflections upon any one, the facts which contradicted three prominent incorrect statements, viz; 1st. That there had been no conversions at Antioch, 2d. That none of those appointed on the New Faculty, had ever preached "repentance" in the College, and 3d. That "all members of the Christian denomination had been excluded from the Faculty." My answer to the last contains the following:

"The Faculty for this year, as appointed by the Com-

mittee, consists of President Mann, Professors Holmes, Warriner, Cary, Craig, Weston, Mrs. Dean and Miss Crocker. It is true that Prof. Holmes did not accept his appointment, because he thought another field offered him better opportunities for usefulness; but this is not to be charged to the Committee. Of the above eight persons, six are members of Christian churches. Three of them, (Holmes, Craig, and Weston,) are of families belonging to the Christians, and they have themselves been members of Christian churches ever since they belonged to any church; some of them for more than twenty years. If they have been under censure, or their fidelity suspected, it has been unknown to them."

Mr. Allen has given a garbled extract from this, imputed to it a motive of his own invention, and then from his own garbling and invention, deduced a charge of "stupidity," "deception," or "equivocation." But I am willing to leave the article and its expressed motive to answer for themselves.

But the article, innocent, truthful and well meant as it was,—brought down upon my head bolt after bolt of envenomed wrath. On the day the paper was received in town, Mr. Doherty came to my house boiling over with rage, as I hope never to see another man, and accused me of "deserting my best friends," "giving them a stab in the dark," "virtually charging so good and godly a man as Eld. James Maple, with falsehood," etc., etc. I asked him what the article contained erroneous or false. He did not point out anything of the kind, but said, "We have been hoping to get rid of the clique which has possession of the College, and now you are taking sides with them, and against your best friends." I told him that the article did not take sides for or against anybody, but

merely stated facts which he could not deny; and if he would read it in a little cooler state of mind he would see it so.

When I learned that he was the real author of the editorials, which he had so far imposed upon Elder Maple as to lead him to adopt, I saw a reason for his extreme sensitiveness for Elder Maple's honor. Bro. Maple himself had no such words to say.

To the point about not hearing "repentance" preached, Elder Craig also made reply. In answer to both, Mr. Jacobs came out again, accusing me of injuring "Prof. Holmes' reputation and that of the denomination." This Mr. Allen quotes and endorses. That is, according to them, a man's reputation is injured by saying that he is moved by considerations of "better opportunities for usefulness." I can well afford to stand condemned by such ethics as that. If such is the gospel which "Eld. Jacobs" is accustomed to preach, he is certainly a fit candidate for the encomiums of I. W. Allen! If these men knew Bro. Holmes as well as I do, they would know that he does not consider such principles injurious to the reputation of anybody.

Mr. J. also put a series of questions, why I did not say certain things of Prof. Holmes? To which I answered in short, that "if I had said the things which he suggested, 1st, I should have told some things which I did not know to be true; 2nd, I should have told some things which I knew not to be true; and 3d, I should not have told the whole truth." This article was sent, its receipt acknowledged, and its publication promised; but "the gate was shut down" before it saw the light.

Mr. Allen [p. 233], has taken pains to copy this promise to publish, and to insinuate therefrom that Elder

Maple pursued a partizan course; but the fact that it was *not* published, he studiously withholds! Such is the impartiality of his "History."

MR. ALLEN RETURNS TO YELLOW SPRINGS.

A few weeks after the term opened Mr. Allen returned to Yellow Springs. I resolved that, notwithstanding the differences between him and some members of the Faculty, I would, on my own part, show him the same friendliness as ever. I met him first in Antioch Hall, and asked him such questions as a friend would ask a friend under such circumstances. His answers were very short and monosyllabic. I appreciated his spirit, but did not change my resolution. At my earliest opportunity I called at his house. It was on an evening when there was to be a lecture. During our conversation he took occasion to make frequent remarks about the College and those now connected with it, such as no gentleman would make. The bell rang for lecture, and I started to leave. In the hall, just as I was leaving, he too attacked me about the afore-mentioned article. I asked him what there was in it false or objectionable. He said he did not know as it contained anything untrue, but he thought my friends would think very strange, and be very sorry to see me taking sides against them. I told him that I took no sides, but had only, in the most candid manner, made a correction of statements which he, as well as I, knew to be false. He acknowledged that those statements were not true, but thought that I should not have interfered. Thus he kept me, talking to me in a very overbearing manner, till long after the lecture bell had done ringing. I told him at last, that it seemed to me that those who objected to my statements, which they acknowledged to be true, in correction of others which they acknowledged

to be false, thereby confessed that they were engaged in a cause which depended on falsehood for its support; and the man who told the truth they counted as an enemy. I soon took my leave.

From all this bearing of his I saw that my disposition to remain on friendly terms with him was not reciprocated. He never called on me afterward, except on some business connected with his persecution of the College, and then at times and under circumstances which, considering the sickness in my family, a thoughtful and unselfish man would not have used for such a purpose.

THE MERITS OF MR. ALLEN'S CASE.

When I came to College at the opening of the term, September, 1857, I was ignorant of the true reasons which had influenced the Committee and the Faculty in the case of Mr. Allen. I was inclined to think they had acted without sufficient cause, and nothing occurred but the repulsive acts of himself and Mr. Doherty before described, to influence me to the contrary. Though I was a member of the Faculty, and, I believe, had the confidence of all, no one breathed a word to me respecting the causes which had led them to refuse to co-operate with him until the time of the meeting of the Committee. All expressed themselves as desirous to do nothing which would throw a reproach upon his character, if it could possibly be avoided, and their acts were consistent with that feeling.

But I wish now to state some of the evidence which afterward came to my knowledge, which completely satisfied me that that action was just, and that they could not consult the interests of the cause we all love and do otherwise than they did. And, as many of these facts came

to my knowledge for the first time during the investigations of the "self-constituted Committee," I propose to present what I may say in connection with facts pertaining to that investigation.

ORIGIN OF THE COMMITTEE.

Mr. Allen employs several pages in an effort to impeach the character of that Committee and the manner of getting them together. Of their character I need say nothing; they are known too widely and too well to call for it. But of what he says of the origin of the Committee a few facts should be known.

Everybody who read the Gospel Herald at that time remembers that the appointing Committee were repeatedly called on to give the reasons for their action, if they had any; otherwise they must rest under the imputation of having acted without reason. The first direct suggestion which came to my knowledge that there should be a Committee to investigate the matter, was from Eld. O. J. Wait. He wrote to Mr. Fay that the appointing Committee must show their reasons, if they had any, or rest under just censure; and proffered his services if they were needed. Besides, Eld. Wait says in the *Gospel Herald*, April 17, 1859, "It is proper to say, that a call was made upon Mr. Fay to give the facts, if he had them, to the public, or there would be a further abandoning of the College. I have the letters to prove this."

In obedience to these suggestions, Mr. Fay says, he invited men in whom the public had the fullest confidence, to come to Yellow Springs. The men came, and constituted themselves into a Committee to investigate the charges publicly made against the appointing Committee. The complaint was before the public: the Committee had

heard it. Mr. Allen was invited to be present and say whatever else he had to say on the same side; but he did not appear. The Committee heard Mr. Fay's defence and gave their verdict to the world.

In his effort to throw ridicule upon the affair Mr. Allen has not hesitated to descend to falsehood. He gives a pretended report of an interview between Mr. Fay and Elder Simonton on this matter, of which Elder S. says, "He puts words into my mouth and takes them out again, and sends them to the world, that *I never said to him or any other man.*" Again, "This, Mr. Fay never said to me, *neither did I say it to Mr. Allen. The first I ever heard of such talk was in Mr. Allen's book.*"

Mr. McWhinney also says that Mr. Allen's assertion that he promised to call on him at the Springs and had not done it, thereby falsifying his word, is itself a positive falsehood! as he can prove by several persons who were present at the time alleged. The fact was, Mr. McWhinney became disgusted with Mr. Allen's impertinence and pertinacity, and told him plainly that he had "*no confidence in his moral honesty!*" He had no disposition to make him any such promise and did not do it.

The following from Dr. H. C. Foster, shows that Mr. Allen has also misrepresented him:

"In Mr. I. W. Allen's book, published last Fall, I see a mis-statement respecting myself which I wish to correct. The reasons which he there assigns [page 112] as preventing my going to Yellow Springs to meet with the 'self-constituted Committee,' are not the reasons which prevented me, and I never gave them to him as such. My only reason for not going was a professional engagement which forbade my going.

“ Mr. Allen called on me a short time after the report of the Committee was published, and asked me what I thought of it. I told him I thought it a very judicious report, as it merely gave their opinion without reflecting personally upon any one. He said, it must be that I was not acquainted with the facts in the case, and proceeded to make a very long statement of what he considered the injustice done him. I may have made some such remarks as he refers to, conditioned upon the truth of his statement then made, but never otherwise.

“I told him, in the same conversation, that I was a great friend and admirer of Mr. Mann, and thought him eminently fitted for his position. He said, so was he: and he considered him better qualified as an educator than any other man in the country, and he had no desire to see him removed from his place.*

[Signed,]

H. C. FOSTER.

Yellow Springs, June 22, 1859.”

This is sufficient to show the unfairness and untruthfulness of that “introduction.”

A few days before the meeting of that Committee, after the day was appointed and Mr. Allen invited to meet

* It may seem strange that, while Mr. Allen was pursuing Mr. Mann with such a malignity, he should express himself, as he did to Dr. Foster, so highly in Mr. Mann's praise. Such expressions are widely at variance with the entire estimate of Mr. Mann's character which his book represents him to have held for a long time. But there is abundant proof that he was accustomed to speak in this way whenever he thought the contrary would be unpopular. There are very many in the country who could offer similar testimony. A lady, whose name can be given if necessary, says:

“In a conversation with Mr. I. W. Allen, which occurred at Yellow Springs within a fortnight ending Aug. 7th, 1857, on the subject of Antioch College, he said that, although he did not agree with Mr. Mann on many points, yet he regarded him as the best man for the Presidency of Antioch College.’”

them, Mr. Fay informed me of the fact, told me who were to constitute the Committee, and asked me if I thought Allen would meet them. My reply was that that would depend on the confidence he had in the justice of his own cause. The Committee was certainly unexceptionable; being all strongly denominational men, widely known, and known as widely for wisdom and candor; and if he believed his cause to be just and defensible, he would certainly meet them. But if, on the other hand, he knew that he was guilty and in the wrong, he would not meet them, and would then cry out, that it was an *ex parte* trial. The result showed that I judged rightly.

COMMITTEE'S MEETING.

The Committee met. I was invited to meet with them, so that I might know (what no one had communicated to me before) the causes of the action of the appointing Committee. I attended a part of the time. In the forenoon students were examined, class by class, as to their views of the competency of Prof. Doherty. All who had signed the petition requesting his removal re-affirmed their opinion, and those who did not sign it,—even those who had ever been and still were his warm personal friends—expressed their concurrence in the conviction that he was totally unfit for the Chair of Rhetoric.

In the afternoon the testimony of the Faculty in the case of Mr. Allen, was examined, until the Committee said that they could ask for no more.

In speaking of the report which they would make the Committee expressed their desire to make it as general as possible, so that the least possible injury might be done to Mr. Allen. This they did; and thereby brought on

themselves the severe censure of one whom they wished to save. This censure created the necessity for the Second Report, in which the allegations were specifically stated. The review of this Second Report constitutes a large part of this "History." I wish to refer to the specifications, and the evidence.

PRELIMINARY QUESTIONS.

But let us first look at a few preliminary considerations. The real question which presents itself to every mind interested in this matter, as it did to those of the Committee, is: *What was the reason which led the appointing Committee to decline to re-appoint Ira W. Allen to the Chair of Mathematics?* and, *was that reason sufficient to justify their action?*

The whole aim of Mr. Allen's book is to show that the reason which influenced the Committee, as well as Mr. Mann and other members of the Faculty who refused to serve with him, was a hostility to "religious power" and "vital piety," to prayer meetings, and to religious and denominational interests generally. The question, then, is, *Had Mr. Allen, by his "religious power" and "vital piety" rendered himself obnoxious to such a spirit?*

Mr. A. himself labors sufficiently on p. 19 to show that he was decidedly opposed to taking any part in the Sabbath services in the Chapel. So his religion was not dangerous there!

The members of the Christian Association and supporters of the College prayer meeting, know and testify that, though he roomed in the same building in which the prayer meetings were held, he almost never attended them, nor manifested any special interest in them during the three years of his connection with the College,

with the exception of one term, when he held the office of President. This fact was so notorious that for this very reason the Association refused to re-elect him to the Presidency when his name was again suggested. [Mr. Doherty never to my knowledge attended one.]

The members of the Church in town know and testify that, during all this time, they do not recollect of seeing him in prayer meeting, monthly Church meeting, or Sunday school; and that he took no interest in maintaining public worship in the Church until Prof. Doherty kindly tendered them his services.

All these, too, are facts which came within my own knowledge; and I know them to be so. If Mr. Mann and the Committee really feared too much vital religion, Mr. Allen certainly was one of the most harmless men in that direction whom they could select. They could not object to *him* on that account.

And what applies to his religion, applies also to his denominationality; for, if a denomination has interests diverse from genuine piety and Christian works, it should not be called a "Christian" denomination. And, moreover, if Mr. Allen, or any of his friends can point to a single act of his, specially promotive of denominational interests, which may not be naturally accounted for by his motives of ambition and self-promotion, I should be happy to have them do it. I have never known of such an act. So there was as little danger to be apprehended from his denominationality as from his piety.

Another fact throws some light upon the real position of the College managers on this point. If there was any such opposition to "vital piety" as Messrs. Allen and Doherty allege, it would be manifest against this Christian Association, and especially against its leading men.

This Association was organized under the influence of Prof. Holmes, I think, during the first term of the College. It had been in existence, at the time of the Committee's action, four years, or twelve terms. Its Presidents and leaders of the prayer meetings had been,—Thomas Holmes, five terms; Austin Craig, two terms; J. B. Weston, four terms;—all appointed upon the new Faculty;—I. W. Allen, one term—left off. This is sufficient to show what an entire sham is his pretense that any such objections lay against him.

POINTS PROVEN.

Let us now look at the reasons presented to the investigating Committee, and at the same time judge whether Mr. Allen did not exhibit more policy than sense of justice, by staying away, and telling what he might have done if his side had been heard. The Committee, while abundantly competent to judge of the testimony, were also competent to judge if it was such as should not be received till another tale was told.

The Committee say, "It was proven to us :

"1st. That Mr. Allen, though very friendly to Mr. Mann's face, and often visiting him and sharing his hospitalities, and the pleasure of his social parties, had for a long time secretly used his utmost influence to create a prejudice against Mr. Mann, and that, too, where such prejudice would prove most fatal to Mann's usefulness as President of the College."

Letters and testimony were presented which proved to a certainty, that Mr. Allen did, in 1855, write many letters to Mr. Fay, making most serious charges against Mr. Mann and his administration; that when Mr. Fay

proposed to make complaint to Mr. Mann, and to have the alleged abuses corrected, Mr. Allen refused to have his name used, and suddenly called home his letters. And all this time he was visiting Mr. Mann with the appearance of friendship; meeting him with his usual smirky smile and studied suavity. The evidence of this is in Mr. Fay's possession, and the public can know and judge for themselves.

Mr. Allen does not meet this at all in his book, but attempts to divert the mind of his readers by abusing the Committee and other persons.

The Committee say,—

“2nd. That when Mr. Allen had brought an accusation against one of the subordinate teachers, and failed to sustain it, he then *positively* falsified the record to screen himself. This was when Mr. Allen was acting as Secretary of the Faculty.”

The record itself in which the entry was made was present and the Committee saw for themselves. It can be seen by any who wish. The evidence in this case was not *ex parte*; it was in the hand writing of Mr. Allen himself. All his personal abuse can not invalidate it.

HIS DENIAL OF HIS VOTE.

The Committee say again,—

“3d. It was proved to us that in the Faculty meetings he would cast his vote in a given way, and then go to the students, and preparingly to keeping on friendly terms with them, would insinuate that he voted differently; and in some instances positively denying his vote.”

This, so far as regards the character of a man as a member of a College Faculty, is one of the most serious charges which could possibly be made. If a man is per-

fidiously false, and intriguingly hostile to his colleagues to the extent which this indicates, there is not a man living, of common sense and competent judgment, who would say that he should be retained in his place for another day.

Mr. Allen says this "accusation is untrue," "absurd and silly," "too preposterous for men of common sense to swallow," and challenges the world to prove it "other than false." All this, perhaps, might well be said of his conduct; but, how is it with the accusation? The case is this:

A few weeks before the close of the year, when Mr. Allen finished his Professorial career, the "Alethezetean Society"—a literary society composed exclusively of ladies—asked permission of the Faculty to hold a public Anniversary and Exhibition. The Faculty refused to grant the request. Prof. Doherty was specially strenuous in his objection to it, and supported his position by protracted argument. When the question on granting the petition was put, *Mr. Allen voted in the negative*, with his friend, Mr. Doherty. That he voted thus is proved by all the then members of the Faculty. Mr. Allen himself, does not deny, but assumes and admits it, and says that he never told any person whomsoever that he voted differently.

At this refusal, the members of the Society were greatly incensed and indignant, and other ladies of the school and very many of the gentlemen sympathized with them. It was a favorable opportunity for Mr. Allen, by misrepresenting the case, to seize upon this excited state of feeling and turn the force of it against Mr. Mann, and make capital of it for himself. And *this he actually did*.

The testimony before the Committee was that of Dr.

Warriner, who testified to having received information of students, that Mr. Allen had said that he voted in favor of granting the petition. Mr. Allen says "they only *supposed* that I voted in the affirmative," "they *inferred* so," and denies having told any person that he voted otherwise than he did.

For a sample of his veracity I would call attention to the following testimony, from highly intelligent and unimpeachable persons,—Mr. Edward Rice, the real efficient Building Agent, of Antioch College, his wife and daughter.

"In the Summer of 1857, Prof. I. W. Allen called at the Machine Shop where I was at work, and conversation between him and myself turned on the action of the Faculty in the case of the Alethezetean Society. I expressed myself in favor of the ladies' having an opportunity for a public Exhibition. Mr. Allen said that he was in favor of the same and always had been; that he had done all he could in the Faculty for them to have the privilege, and had voted in favor of it every time.

[Signed,]

"EDWARD RICE.

"*Yellow Springs, O., June 20th, 1859.*"

"In the Summer of 1857, soon after it was known that Prof. I. W. Allen was not to be re-appointed to his place in the Faculty of the College, he was at our house and we inquired of him what was the cause of the objection to him. He said that it was because he did not agree with the members of the Faculty in everything, and referred particularly to what had been done in the case of the Alethezetean Society. He said that he had used all his influence in the Faculty to have them granted permission to have their public meeting, and had vo-

ted for it every time. He said that he and one other, were all that favored it, and that he was the only one who had consistently advocated their interests throughout. This, he said, he told us in confidence, and we never should have named it, if we had not heard of his telling the same to various other persons, and if he had not denied ever having said it.

[Signed,]

MRS. ELVIRA RICE,
REBECCA S. RICE.

Yellow Springs, O., June 20th, 1859."

If Mr. Allen desires more proof to be given that he has told persons he "voted differently from what he did," he can have it.

But besides his positive and direct false statements, his insinuations to the same effect were numerous and decided, as Mr. Allen Hill and many other students can testify. In fact, it is well known by all of us who were conversant with the circumstances, that the impression was general, in the school and in the town, that Mr. Allen had voted in favor of the ladies having their Exhibition, and that impression was based on what Mr. Allen himself had said. There was a general surprise when, after the investigation of this Committee, it came out that he voted against it.

Mr. Allen says he is not "responsible for the suppositions and inferences of people." But he is responsible for his positive assertions; and he is responsible for the data which he gives, howsoever he gives them, from which inferences are necessarily and legitimately drawn.

Look now at the perfidy of the whole transaction. He votes in Faculty-meeting for a certain measure, which he afterwards finds to be received by many with disfavor. By a mutual understanding, the members of that Faculty

are not to relate in public, and comment upon each other's votes. He trusts that, by the fidelity of his colleagues to their trusts, the true nature of his own vote will not be exposed. Taking advantage of their fidelity, he denies his own vote, declares that he voted differently, seeks to turn the tide of bitter dissatisfaction against his colleagues, and thinks to reap from it a harvest of honor for himself. When exposed, he denies his denial and prints it in a book!! Did ever depravity run deeper than this?

With these things recently enacted and fresh in their minds, what Faculty, fit to be a Faculty, would consent to have such a man for a colleague? and what Committee, fit to be a Committee, would appoint him in the face of such facts, and over the head of such objections? If this were his lone and single sin, is it not sufficient to condemn him to banishment from such a position, to say the least? How much more, then, when it is but one of a catalogue!

MR. ALLEN'S THEORY AND PRACTICE OF FALSEHOOD.

The Committee say further:

“4th. It was proven to us that Mr. Allen did tell several positive falsehoods to Mr. Fessenden concerning Mr. Mann; and when Mr. Fessenden, as his only means of self-defense, told Mr. Mann what Mr. Allen had told, he was severely censured by Mr. Allen. Mr. Allen said to Mr. Fessenden, ‘you ought to have denied to Mr. Mann you ever heard me say anything about it, for it was not designed for other men's ear.’ Mr. Fessenden inquired: ‘Do I understand you, Mr. Allen, to say that I should have denied the facts?’ Mr. Allen replied, ‘It

is morally right for you to say to Mr. Mann that you did not know, and that I never told you.' This *enormous* charge was sustained by the testimony of Professors Fessenden and J. B. Weston."

In the investigation before this Committee, I was not a witness on any point; but when the statement of Prof. Fessenden was made, some parts of which related to facts with which I was acquainted, especially that relating to the conversation above referred to, the Committee asked me if his statement accorded with my recollection of the facts. I told them that it did.

Of the part which Mr. Allen acted to alienate Prof. Fessenden from Mr. Mann, and attach him to his own interests, Prof. F. himself can testify.

The first of this matter which came to my knowledge, Mr. Fessenden came to me in the College Hall, and said that he wanted some advice. He said that Prof. Allen had for a long time, been saying things to him derogatory to Mr. Mann, to prejudice his mind against him, and to make him believe that Mr. Mann was secretly his enemy. Mr. Allen had told him these things, under the charge of secrecy, and he had never lisped them to any one. But in some way Mr. Mann must have got hold of it; for in a recent conversation, he [Mr. Mann] had put to him the direct question, whether Mr. Allen had been endeavoring to prejudice his mind against him, and it was so put that he could not give a truthful answer without acknowledging that he had. He said he presumed that Mr. Mann would go to Mr. Allen about it; and he asked what was best to do? My advice was to go to Mr. Allen directly, and tell him the fact. This accorded with Mr. Fessenden's previous convictions; but he said he was unwilling to see Mr. Allen alone, and

asked me as a mutual friend to go with him as a witness to the conversation. I did so; when the conversation took place, from the gist of which the above report is made.

Mr. Allen, in his book, denies the tenor of this conversation, gives his own version of it, and then turns off, as usual, to personal abuse.

Such a conversation as Mr. Allen reports *never took place!* It is the most of it sheer fabrication. Mr. Fessenden told Mr. Allen, as he had told me, that Mr. Mann, in a recent conversation, had put a direct question to him as to whether he [Allen] had said anything to him calculated to prejudice his mind against Mr. Mann, and make him believe that Mr. Mann was unfriendly to him; that the question was so put that he could not conscientiously equivocate or deny; and so he had told him plainly that he had. He asked Mr. Allen if he thought he could be justified, under the circumstances, in answering otherwise than he did. Mr. Allen replied, that *he would have been justified in saying, No!* That what he had said to Mr. F. was said in confidence, and designed for no other person's ears; that it was none of Mr. Mann's business, and it would *not* have been a *falsehood* for him to deny it; for, so far as Mr. Mann had any business with it, it was, *No!* He then turned to me and asked if I did not think so? I disagreed to his ethics. He then attempted to justify his opinion, by quoting the practice of lawyers and politicians who, as he said, made a practice of denying what was told to them in confidence, believing it to be right; and he thought Mr. Mann would have done the same.

His "conversation about politicians" was subordinate,

and brought in afterward for self-justification in the strange rule of morals which he had avowed.

That Mr. Fessenden was "extremely unhappy," "could not sleep," felt wretched, hoped for pardon, &c., are all equally fabrications.

The avowal of such a theory respecting what to me seemed positive falsehood, made a deep impression on my mind, and very much weakened my confidence in Mr. Allen's moral integrity: but I never mentioned it to any one, not even to Mr. Fessenden, till in the fall of 1857, Mr. F. asked me if I remembered the conversation. We found at once, on naming it, that our recollections of it perfectly agreed.

I have read the above statement to Mr. Fessenden, and he affirms that it is a true and correct statement of the facts.

Mr. Allen's recent false and tortuous course shows the ruinous tendency of his loose code of morals.

HIS COURSE TOWARD PROF. HOLMES.

Again, the Committee say—

"5th. It was proved to us that Mr. Allen himself instigated the removal of Prof. Holmes, and afterwards tried to convince Holmes, and others, that it was an insult to him and a great indignity to the Christian Church."

About the last part of this specification, there is no question. Mr. Allen's repeated references to this case, and the spirit of them, show plainly enough that so much is true. The only question is in regard to the statement that "Mr. Allen himself instigated the removal of Mr. Holmes."

I suppose the Committee were careless in the use of a word, for Mr. Holmes was never "removed," and there is no reason to believe that it was ever designed that he should be, unless it was so designed by Mr. Allen. The real circumstances were these: Some difficulty and dissatisfaction were excited against Prof. Holmes, which culminated at the time of a meeting of the Trustees in March, 1855, and resulted in his asking leave of absence to go to Europe to prosecute studies which pertained to the duties of his [Greek] Chair. Whether this leave of absence was as far as the intention of Mr. Allen's *instigations* reached, or whether he really "*instigated*" his "*removal*," though he failed to accomplish it, the evidence in the case must show.

Upon this point there is abundant testimony in the hands of Mr. Mann, which he will give to the public, and to that I would refer for a fuller detail of facts bearing on some parts of this question.

But I wish to present a few facts which have come to my own knowledge, to show the reason of my concurrence with the conclusion of the Committee on this point.

1. It is a well known fact that Mr. Allen, when he was in Europe, *did not devote his time to the study of the Mathematics but of Greek*. He did this with the expectation of ultimately occupying the Chair of Greek in the Faculty.

2. After his return he was accustomed to speak of his preference for Greek over the Mathematics.

He refers to this in a recent newspaper article, in which he speaks of a chair for which he was better prepared than for the one he occupied.

3. He was accustomed to speak disparagingly of Prof.

Holmes' attainments in Greek, as well as of his standing with the students.

I heard him, at the time of the Trustees' meeting, in an interview with Mr. Fay and A. M. Merrifield, speak very decidedly of Prof. Holmes' want of qualifications. In proof of what he said, he spoke of a certain paper, containing a Greek exercise which Mr. H. had written, and which had fallen into the hands of Mr. Burlingame, in which he said there were many errors; he told the number.

He spoke also of other things which he considered disqualifications. He expressed himself very decidedly as considering the prejudice against Mr. Holmes well founded, and as deeming it impossible for him to sustain himself in his Chair. Mr. Merrifield agreed with him in opinion, and very learnedly observed that he thought Holmes "talked too much" for a successful Professor. They seemed quite astonished when I disagreed with them in opinion; but I had then just finished the Greek of our course under Prof. Holmes, and my opinion was of small weight against a man who had studied that language in the German Universities.

At that time I supposed that Mr. Allen was merely expressing his opinion among friends, and that he did not express the same elsewhere. But when afterwards I heard of the same Greek-exercise story, as told by him in various quarters, I saw that he had made diligent use of it.

He urged the same objection to Mr. Fay at another time, and when Mr. Fay asked him what could be done he answered, "Let Holmes take the Mathematics, and I can take the Greek. I am much better prepared in that than in Mathematics!" He has recently said in the

newspapers that some of the Trustees proposed that he take another Chair for which he was much better fitted than for the one he "was administering." He probably refers to this conversation, in which the proposition came not from a Trustee but from himself. I do not believe the Trustee can be found who will confess to making him such a proposition, unless it be his co-plotter, Mr. A. M. Merrifield. But this is far from being the only case in which he has put into the mouths of others words spoken by himself.

The Greek-exercise story was also told to Prof. C. S. Pennell, to convince him, (what Prof. Pennell strictly denied,) that Mr. Holmes was incompetent to this position. He urged the opinion to Prof. Pennell that the real and natural disqualifications of Prof. Holmes were such *that no amount of study could ever fit him for Professor of Greek*. This I should consider very much like instigating a "removal." The same objections were urged also to other members of the Faculty.

I have a letter from Prof. Pennell, (between whom and Prof. Holmes, by the way, a friendship like that of brothers always existed,) stating the facts in this case; but as Mr. Mann has another from him which he will probably give to the public I will refer the reader to that.

Here I find Mr. Allen presenting these objections to myself—a student—to Mr. Merrifield and Mr. Fay, Trustees, in my presence; to all the members of the Faculty, and to how many more persons of the two former classes I do not know.

This Greek exercise, which Mr. Burlingame obtained and examined, and which, through Mr. B., afforded Mr. Allen the data which he used so widely against Mr.

Holmes, was, as I learn from Bro. Holmes himself, an exercise which he prepared in haste, in the early part of his stay in Yellow Springs. He never looked it over to correct it and never used it. It was not destroyed, but by some means was slipped between the leaves of a book. This book was borrowed by Mr. Burlingame, (who now stands forth as champion No. 2, to proclaim the abuses of Bro. Holmes,) the paper found and examined,—the book returned, and borrowed again, probably for a re-examination of the paper—the data furnished to Mr. Allen, who claims to be champion No. 1,—the thing kept secret from Mr. Holmes—and the data thus obtained, backed up by both their names, used with Faculty, Trustees and students, to the damage of Mr. Holmes.

After Mr. Holmes returned from Europe, learning the part which Mr. Allen played against him, he went to his library, took the book which Mr. B. had borrowed, found the exercise referred to, and recalled the circumstances above stated.

WORSE YET.

But it was not literary and social qualifications alone which Mr. Allen attacked; nor before Faculty, Trustees and students alone that his assaults were made. The domestic relations were not too sacred for the breath of his slander, nor the table of a public boarding house too public for its proclamation. Read the following testimonial from Dr. and Mrs. Cheney, and compare it with the loud profession of sympathy for Mr. and Mrs. Holmes with which his book abounds, and answer if you ever knew a case of more unmitigated depravity and deceit. ┘

TESTIMONIAL OF DR. AND MRS. CHENEY.

“During the Spring and Summer of 1855, Prof. I. W. Allen boarded with us at the Water-Cure in Yellow Springs. After the difficulties arose at the time of Prof. Holmes’ obtaining leave of absence, we inquired of Mr. Allen what was the objection to Prof. Holmes; whether he was incompetent to his place, or what was the matter. Mr. Allen seemed to waive the question of his competency, but said that the fact was he could not be himself. ‘Why,’ asked Mrs. Cheney, ‘what is there to prevent him?’ ‘It is his wife,’ Mr. Allen answered, ‘she is a real virago and rules him with a rod of iron, so that he cannot be himself. If I should wake her up,’ said he, ‘I should expect to have my head snapped off!’

“He was accustomed to speak in this way of Mrs. Holmes. Of Prof. Holmes he did not say anything directly disparaging, except as regarded the influence of his wife over him, which he held up in the manner described: neither did he ever speak anything in his praise. Prof. C. S. Pennell, on the other hand, who also boarded at the Water-Cure a part of the time, was accustomed to speak in high praise of Prof. Holmes, frequently and warmly.

“This conversation was especially impressed upon our memories from the fact that, a little after this, Mr. Allen appeared suddenly to change, and to pretend to great friendship for Mrs. Holmes, and to speak of her and Mr. Holmes as being greatly abused. This sudden and unaccountable change led us to inquire of one of the teachers what could be the cause of it. We were answered that it was “another move in Mr. Allen’s game.

[Signed,]

A. CHENEY,

MARGARET J. CHENEY

“*Yellow Springs, June 20th, 1859.*”

These facts, my friends, have come to my knowledge. Elder Holmes is, and has been for years, my warm personal friend and Christian brother. I feel keenly every thrust which I know to be made at him, *by whomsoever it may be made*. And while I know these facts, and see the, to me, transparent hypocrisy and hollow-heartedness of the sympathy professed so loudly by Messrs. Allen and Burlingame, and know, too, that the whole object of it is to gain an advantage to themselves by having some of the lustre of the bright and noble character of Mr. Holmes reflected upon the darkness of their own; I confess myself disgusted, and shocked and wounded.

And Bro. Holmes himself no more thanks Mr. Allen for his voluntary sympathy, and appreciates no more highly his pretended friendship than do I. I have had frequent letters from him during all this time of Mr. Allen's war, and especially since it was advertised that he was going to publish a book. In these letters he freely expresses his condemnation of Mr. Allen's course, his warm sympathy for Antioch College and the interests of the Christian denomination. In Sept., 1858, he wrote me, asking, "Is there any such opinion at Yellow Springs as that I am exerting an influence against Antioch, or that I am co-operating with Allen?" and goes on to speak of Allen's efforts to get letters from him to publish, and his absolute refusal to be, in any way, drawn into any such a controversy. In so far, then, as Mr. Allen has drawn him in it has been without his consent and against his will. And it is that fact which makes it necessary to bring his name in here.

Bro. Holmes expresses himself frequently in a similar spirit; but the gist of the whole is given in a letter of Feb. 8th, 1859, in which he declares his conviction, in so

many words, that Mr. Allen has been the main-spring of the trouble *from the time of the first movement against him*, and also expresses that his sympathies are fully with Antioch.

At the end of all this accumulation of proof it may be asked, what motive could Mr. Allen have in desiring the absence or removal of Mr. Holmes from the Chair of Greek? The answer to this is plainly seen in the fact that he studied Greek, and not Mathematics, when in Europe, and in his proposition to Mr. Fay to take the Greek himself.

But it may be again enquired, if such was his desire, why did he not continue to urge it after Mr. Holmes had left? The reason for that can be well understood by those who know how strenuously he labored to have his *alter ego*, Mr. Burlingame, appointed as Mr. Holmes' substitute. To have had his faithful friend and co-actor with him in the Faculty would have promoted his ultimate end much better than a change in his own position, to the exclusion of Mr. Burlingame.

Finally, the Committee say,—

“6th. It was proven to us from his own letters, that Mr. Allen had circulated false reports touching the general administration of the College.”

This, Mr. Allen does not seek to controvert, but to palliate. He says [p. 162],—

“It is possible that in writing to intimate friends I may have mentioned some of the current statements in Yellow Springs, touching College transactions, not altogether free from error; yet even of this I am by no means certain.” If he had always been as cautious about contradicting his own letters it would have been wiser in him.

Here, my friends, are some of the points which stand proved against Mr. Allen. Through seventy-two pages of "Review," and pretended defense, he has not in the least invalidated or excused one of them, except what rests upon his own independent and unsupported denial. And even these denials, with the proofs now brought against them, weaken his cause rather than strengthen it. In all these pages he has substituted personal abuse and slander for arguments and proofs.

I now leave it with you to say whether Mr. Allen is not plainly proven guilty of the things alleged, and whether they are not super-abundantly sufficient to justify his omission from the Faculty of Antioch College. I believe they are.

THE MOTIVE.

But it will be asked what could have been the *motive* for all this? And this is not an unimportant question. This question Mr. Allen makes the strength of his argument on several points.

It is not necessary to prove that the motive is sufficient to justify the act. Sin never has such a motive. It is always short-sighted and foolish.

That Mr. Allen's motive was not religious or denominational zeal, may be seen from the nature of the acts (for the cause of God is never promoted by wrong), as well as what has been said in a prior part of this inquiry.

That it was not any love to the Christian denomination which moved him to those acts, nor to his violent and unscrupulous warfare upon the College and its friends which have employed him for the last two years, is also seen by his own declaration to Elder John Ellis, that if he did not succeed in what he was now attempting, *he should join the Presbyterians!*

It has been said that Mr. Allen denies having said this. Very likely he does. But when a question of veracity lies between I. W. Allen, and Elder John Ellis, who will hesitate to decide with whom the truth lies?

The facts, as I learn them from Bro. Ellis, are these. When Mr. Allen was left off from the new Faculty, Bro. Ellis, to a considerable extent, sympathized with him. In an interview with Mr. A., after he saw the course he was taking, Bro. Ellis advised him to be less violent, and not to try to raise difficulties out of which no good could grow. He told him that it would be ruinous to himself; for though he might never again have a post in Antioch College, there would be other denominational schools where he would be needed, and might be employed if he did not keep up this war. Mr. Allen expressed a disregard for his advice, and said he did not care about denominational schools, for, he said "*if I do not succeed in this, (his present attempts,) I shall join the Presbyterians.*"

If neither of the above was his motive, then what was it?

The key to it all lies in his own remark, (page 113,) "A \$1,000 per year, and a Professorship for life are worth struggling for."

If the above is true, according to his estimate, then \$2,000 per year and a *Presidentship* for life, would be "worth struggling for" twice as hard.

Did Mr. Allen aspire to be President of Antioch College? He denies it, as may be expected. He may never have expressed it in words, except to confidential friends. Then what reason is there for such an inference?

That he desired the removal of Mr. Mann, I infer from his approving intimation to me of what "Bro. Mer-

rifield" said. That he desired to be President himself, I submit, may be legitimately inferred:

1. From the declarations of Mr. Merrifield, his bosom friend and co-plotter, to Mr. and Mrs. Fessenden, together with other reasons given by Mr. F. himself.

2. From the declaration of his other steadfast and electioneering friend, Mr. John A. Layton, as set forth in the following testimonial from Dr. H. C. Foster:

"On the day of the election of Trustees at Antioch College, in 1857, I met Mr. John A. Layton at the railroad station in Enon. I was going to Springfield. Mr. Layton asked me, as I was a scholarship-holder, if I was not going to the Springs to the election of Trustees? I told him I was not. He said I ought to go, for it was a very important election. I asked him how so? He said to-day will decide the fate of Antioch, whether it is to sink or swim. I asked how that was? He said that this election would decide whether Mr. Mann was to remain the President; if so, it would go down; but if some other man could be elected, it might be saved. I asked him if they had another man better than he, and if so, who it was? He said there was another man, and just the man for the place; and that was Prof. Allen. I told him if I had known that any such movement as that was on foot, I should have gone over, for I was a great friend to Mr. Mann, and always was, and believed him the best man to fill that place of any man in America. This was entirely another interview, than that referred to in my letter to Mr. Allen.

[Signed,]

H. C. FOSTER."

"*Yellow Springs, June 21, 1859.*"

3. From a declaration made by his brother, Mr. A. L. Allen. Mr. I. W. Allen has written a long article to ex-

plain away a report arising from this fact; but it does not "stay explained." I am informed by the "Mr. B." named in that article, that in the letter, extracts of which are therein given, he informed Mr. Allen that Mr. O. H. Davis, formerly a student, and a man of unquestionable veracity, told him ("Mr. B.") "that A. L. Allen, the Fall or Summer previous, while they (Allen and Davis) were engaged in an agency in the State of Michigan, had told him (Davis) that his brother, the Prof., was making an effort for the Presidency of Antioch College, and that he was not only making the effort, but that he had a fair prospect of success." Mr. Davis told him "that Allen used this language to him at Ann Arbor." To this part of the letter, no allusion is made. The reason is obvious. Mr. Davis is at present traveling in the South, and his address is not known, or the fact in this case would be given over his own name. But this is sufficient to convince those who know the men, that the statement is true.

From all these considerations, the motive for the strange conduct of Mr. I. W. Allen, seems to me sufficiently plain.

From the facts and data herein before given, my friends and the public can judge whether my conclusions are hastily formed and groundless, or whether I am justified in them, and in the course I have taken.

PERSONALITIES.

There are few things of a more personal nature for which I care less, but of which my friends may wish to know the truth. These I shall soon dispatch.

Mr. Allen says (p. 132,) "I was afterwards informed

that Eli Fay, who was living a mile or more from College, was in reserve that morning in the Ladies' Hall; but he did not show his face in the College Chapel; for Mr. Weston slipped out during Mr. Mann's speech."

Mr. Fay was on that morning at his home, "a mile or more from College," *sick in bed*, as can be proved. He had had no hint whatever of what was going on. The whole assertion is fabrication and not 'history.'

On p. 154 he says, "I [Allen] gave him [Weston] my confidence."

Not so far, it seems, as he did to others; for he never revealed to me his plans which he revealed to other persons. Perhaps it was because I never gave him mine, to any unsafe extent. I received a caution from Bro. Holmes in respect to that, before he left for Europe, and I remembered it.

Again he says of me, (p. 154)—"Since that time [my appointment] he has advocated what he before denounced."

This, or its equivalent, is expressed several times in the book; either by himself or those who knew nothing of the matter, except what they learned from him. He said as much to me once in private conversation; and I challenged him to produce a word or line that I had ever said or written, before my connection with the College Faculty, inconsistent with anything I had said, written or done since that time, and *he could not do it; he has not done it to this day; he can not do it.* There is not a truthful person living who will allege such a thing. What I disapproved before, I disapprove now; what I advocated before, I advocate now. But there is nothing, either in my approvals or disapprovals, inconsistent with the course which I have since taken. My opinion of Mr. Allen, I am obliged to make an exception.

In regard to the assertions of Mrs. Salisbury, [p. 155,] I will say as I said in a private letter to her and her husband:

“I *did* disapprove the *manner* in which Mrs. Holmes was disposed of; and I do now. I have never disguised it; and nobody knows it better than those whom I deemed in the fault. But that I ever said, “that if I were graduated, I would expose to the public the iniquitous conduct of Mr. Mann toward the Christian teachers here,” *is an entire mistake*. I know Mrs. S. used frequently to say that somebody ought to, and asked me why I did not; and I may have said sometime (though I do not remember even that) that my position would forbid it; but if I did, it was not that I ever designed to do such a thing, or thought it called for; but to put off the importunities of an excited woman. Whatever she has attributed to me more than this, was begotten in the chamber of her own imagination. She may think she told the truth, but she is mistaken.”

Twice in his book [pp. 156 and 237] Mr. Allen takes pains to publish an allusion to me by Mr. A. M. Merrifield, as follows:

“The single exception alluded to above, is reported to have said that his religious views have undergone a change since he has been here.”

This was originally written for publication in the Herald of Gospel Liberty, (a paper with which I have been connected, as business partner or writer, for fourteen or fifteen years,) and was designed to damage me among my friends in New England. Fortunately for me, the article was sent where I was too well known for the writer's purpose. Its publication was refused, and it was returned to the writer “with reasons.” It remains for I. W. Al-

len, with whom Mr. Merrifield was in daily consort when he wrote it, to bring it to the light to promote his vengeful ends. Where I am known, it can make no impression; it will be sent back to the man who insinuates it, as it was from the office of the Herald of Gospel Liberty. Its design was to injure me and create distrust in the religious influence of the College, where I am personally unknown.

A. L. Allen, whom Mr. Merrifield gives as authority, will not say that I ever said that my views had undergone a material change in any of the doctrines of the Christian religion, or in those which specially characterize the Christian denomination; as Mr. Merrifield's letter is evidently intended to insinuate. He thinks he remembers of our mutually saying, in some conversation a long time ago, that our views had been modified on some unimportant points, but he does not state when, or where, or what.

This is the sum total of all he reports! Now, I have no recollection, whatever, of any such conversation; I do remember, however, of his intimating during the College year, 1857—'58, that some of my friends thought I had changed; and of my replying that, while misrepresentation was so rife, I expected to be temporarily misunderstood; but time would correct it. I told him, at the same time, that my views of religious truth and College policy were the same as they had ever been, though my opinions of certain men, I confessed, had undergone a change.

I make this statement simply because it is true; and not because I deem it any disgrace for a man to change his views for sufficient reason. The man is to be pitied, rather, who suffers his prejudices to stultify his judgment. But however

much I may hope that advancing years and enlarged opportunities have given me wider and clearer views of truth ; so far as regard a belief in the professed principles of the Christian denomination ; in the Scriptures as inspired by God, and sufficient for man ; in Christ as the son of God and Savior of the world ; in the condition of men as lost in sin, and helpless without regeneration and salvation by Christ ; the only change which time and opportunities have produced in me, is that from strong to stronger.

CONCLUSION.

After having expended himself in the manner he has to get up a book to damage, to the greatest possible degree, all who have not gratified his whim, Mr. Allen has insinuated that he has a large quantity of material yet on hand, from which he can make a book of much severer character than the one he has published. Perhaps he has. It is altogether possible. I would not question it. We have the Arabian Day's Entertainment following the Arabian Nights. And after Dean Swift had published his Gulliver's Travels, if any Lilliputian or Brobdingnag, had complained that he was misrepresented, the author might have told him to *keep still!* for if any complaint was made, he had more material where that came from, as authentic as that he had read, with which he might make a story much worse than the one he had already told.

A man who can fabricate conversations, and put words into men's mouths which they never uttered, as Mr. Allen has in the case of Elder Simonton and others; and can publish testimonials as "signed" by men who had been

dead for months before the date of his paper, as he has in the case of Robert Edmunds; may be expected to have material at his command to furnish any quantity of books, filled with any bad quality of matter.

My unpleasant task is done. It has been reluctantly undertaken; it is gladly laid aside. If I know my own heart I have no personal feelings to gratify. I have sought to keep myself free from them. If I have written severely in anything, it has been the severity of truth alone. I have had no desire to say anything smart or anything wounding, beyond the demands of truth. Perhaps I may have written more than was necessary, as I have certainly more than I intended. Elder I. C. Goff says a half dozen pages would be enough to ruin the book and its author. But I wish its author no harm. My deepest feeling for him is pity; whether he thanks me for it or not.

I have heard that he is sorry that he published his book. I do not wonder. I hope he may have the true spirit of repentance: and that soon may end this unhappy controversy, and more agreeable and profitable employment engage all concerned.

J. B. WESTON.

Yellow Springs, O., June, 1859.

DR. WARRINER'S STATEMENT.

On page 9 of Ira W. Allen's "History of Antioch College," I find the following paragraph. After quoting the resolution, by the adoption of which I was made a member of the Faculty of Antioch College, he adds: "It is said that Dr. Warriner was recommended to Mr. Mann by one or more Unitarian clergymen, and by him to the Board of Trustees! It is also said that Mr. Warriner connected himself with the Christian Church of Cincinnati, in accordance with Mr. Mann's advice, a short time before his name was laid before the Trustees for a Professorship!" Also on the next page: "There are not many men, it is to be hoped, who would connect themselves with a Church for the sake of a Professorship!" I quote with exactness, including exclamation points.

The last two of these points are reasonably intelligible; the first is less so. I certainly was recommended to Mr. Mann by a Unitarian clergyman, by just *one*, according to the best of my knowledge and belief. What occasion there should be for astonishment at that, unless it be at my unworthiness to be thus recommended, is not obvious to my perceptions. The clergyman referred to, is Rev. A. A. Livermore, a man so radiant with the Christian graces, that even the malignant temper and jaundiced vision of Ira W. Allen, have failed to find in him blame or evil. My secret and abiding prayer is, that I may evermore be worthy of such a recommendation.

In regard to my uniting with the Christian Church: that occurred in the month of March *following* my appointment to the Professorship; that appointment was made in October. I do not positively *know* that Mr. Allen was aware of this fact at the time of writing the paragraph I have quoted, but it is my profound conviction that he was. The reasons

for this conviction are, 1st. A somewhat indistinct recollection of a conversation I once had with him on the subject; in which the fact was made to appear. 2d. The cowardly substitute of "It is said" for the bold falsehood he wished to tell. 3d. The intimacy of his relationship to Mr. Summerbell, who knew all about the matter. To say that he did *not* know the facts, makes the case very little better for his integrity and manliness, leaving out all mention of *Christian* fidelity to truth. It would have cost very little labor to have learned the facts.

And what defense can he plead for making such a statement without them? I leave him to take whichever horn of the dilemma consoles him most.

Again: a short time after the appearance of his "History," I received a letter from him, written at the suggestion of Mr. Summerbell, in which he acknowledges the mis-statement under consideration in this wise: referring to the time of my joining the Church, he says: "For a short time *before* read, a short time *after*," &c. He attempts, in brief, to make it appear as a simple *erratum*. The reader may see what sense he can make of the rest of the paragraph, exclamation points and all, with the above substitute of "after" for "before." After this muddle of a concession, the letter goes on to insinuate that, if I didn't join the Church for the sake of a Professorship, I did it for a motive no better than that, viz: for the sake of counting on the Christian side of the Faculty-census. I have no response to make to such an utterly contemptible insinuation, and will add but a single fact more to this statement.

There claims to be a second edition of this "History." It was issued some months after the above letter was written. *It contains no change of the paragraph, no correction of the "Erratum" upon which I have commented.* Which is the lie here? Is the edition a new one? If so, he reiterates what he already acknowledges to be false. If the edition is not a new one, then his advertisement is a falsehood.

H. A. WARRINER.

MR. MAPLE'S STATEMENT.

Mr. I. W. Allen, in his "History of Antioch College," has made a free and unjust use of my name, and made many false charges against me which demand a reply. I propose, in as brief a manner as possible, to give a history of my connection with the very unfortunate controversy about our College, and to contrast Mr. Allen's statements with the facts in the case. I have no hard things to say about Professor Allen, but justice to myself and others requires that the facts should be stated. This history professes to be a "record of facts;" but instead of this it is "a record" of hard sayings, and a misrepresentation of facts. Many things in it are without the shadow of a foundation in "facts;" and where "facts" are mentioned, they are, in many instances, so stated as to make an impression on the mind of the reader, foreign from the truth. In my review I shall confine my remarks to those things which came under my own observation, and leave others to answer the remainder of the work.

The first of August, 1857, Prof. W. H. Doherty came to my house with a written statement, concerning the religious condition of Antioch College, to solicit its publication in the columns of the *Gospel Herald*. That article was the one, amended only in a single sentence, which appeared in his editorial in the *Herald* of August 13th, headed, "*Antioch College. A Warning*,"—and which is quoted by Mr. Allen in his book, pages 79—80. Mr. Doherty assured me that he

could give me the names of fifty students, who, to his personal knowledge, had been made infidels at Antioch College. I had unbounded confidence in his truthfulness, and as he had been in the College from its commencement, I supposed that he could not be mistaken; therefore I did not hesitate, at his request, to adopt his article as my own. Elder D. F. Ladley and J. F. Crist made statements to me that went to confirm Mr. Doherty's testimony; but their information was so vague that I should not have published the editorial that I did, if it had not been for Mr. Doherty's very positive statement to me.

In a few days after my editorial appeared, I received a reply from Bro. W. R. King, which I published in the *Herald*. In my reply to Bro. King, I gave the source of my information on which I had based my previous article. I gave Mr. W. H. Doherty as authority, and Messrs. Crist and Ladley's statements as confirmatory testimony. This I sent to the *Herald* office to be published; but when my editorial appeared, what I had said about Mr. Doherty as the source of my information was not in it. I could not account for this strange omission of the most important part of my article. I enquired of Mr. Geary why it was omitted, and he informed me that Mr. Doherty was in the office at the time when he received my editorial, that he gave it to him to read; and that, without his knowledge, Doherty erased what referred to him. We make no comment on this. It needs none!

During the same month, (August,) Prof. D. came to my house with another article written by himself, reflecting very severely on the managers of the College, for their action in regard to the new Faculty, and pronouncing the institution "unworthy of the confidence of the Christian Church." From his representations, believing the Committee to be acting in the bad faith which his article alleged, I was induced to adopt that also; and it appeared as editorial just as he wrote it, in the *Herald* of Sept. 30, 1857; under the caption—"Antioch College and its new Faculty.—Total

Exclusion of the Representatives of the Christian Church." I did not know then, and he did not tell me, that in addition to those names already in the circular, the Committee had appointed upon the Faculty, Prof. Thos. Holmes, and J. B. Weston, men in whom the denomination had the fullest confidence, and that the latter had accepted the appointment; I supposed it was not so. If I had known this fact, I should not have given my sanction to such an article.

It was in this article, (copied into the "History," pages 82—83,) that the strong language occurs, which Mr. Allen quotes so often, as my expressed opinion of the Faculty and managers of the College, and which he places in contrast with my subsequent course to fasten on me the charge of inconsistency. The language is that of Prof. Doherty; I adopted it because I then believed it to be just; but I soon learned the contrary.

When it became necessary for me to defend the position that I had taken, I applied to Messrs. Doherty and Ladley for the names of the students who had been made infidels at Antioch College, and the reader may judge of my surprise when they could not give one single name. I then found that I had been deceived and misled by false statements, and I must either defend what I now saw to be false, or retract and correct what I had said against the management of the College. As an honest man, I was compelled to take the latter course. This is what Mr. Allen calls turning "a short corner;" but it was only following out my convictions of the truth. Messrs. Doherty and Allen made statements to me that I afterwards found to be without any foundation in truth. These false statements led me into an error, and when I discovered that my information was not true, I endeavored to correct the wrong impression that had been made on the public mind. This was turning from error to truth; from darkness to light; from false to true friends. Any other course would have been unmanly and wicked. This explanation I made to the public through the columns of the *Herald*, as fully and

explicitly as I could, without a disclosure of the unpleasant facts respecting the conduct of individuals. It was made long before the publication of this book, and was sufficient to account for any seeming inconsistency in my course. But this the author wholly omits to mention, and comments upon my course as though no such explanation had been made. Would an honest man do this?

MR. ALLEN'S OBLIQUE STATEMENTS.

There are some other things in Mr. Allen's "History of Antioch College," that demand a passing notice. On page 95 we read: "He (Maple) further remarked that if the committee did not soon reply to the questions proposed to them in the *Herald*, a certain gentleman who was acquainted with the case would publish the facts. I (Allen) determined, therefore, to withhold my review until the said gentleman (whose name Maple did not give) had published his article. For some reason said article did not appear, and why, was quite evident, from the tone of Mr. Maple's conversation on the 2d of Feb."

The points in this question to which I wish to call attention are the following: 1st. He says that I did not give him the name of the gentleman who proposed to give the facts in the case if the Committee did not reply. This leaves the impression on the mind of the reader that he did not know who the gentleman was, when the facts was that he did know; and the gentleman was requested by him to make the statements referred to. 2d. His language implies that I refused to publish "a certain gentleman's" article, when he knows that the gentleman referred to never sent me any such article. Put these facts and Mr. Allen's statements together, and how do they look? I need not draw the contrast. The reader can do this.

On page 96 we read: "He (Maple) now declined the publication of my review, unless the Executive Committee of the Gospel Herald would express their assent; said he

would consult them and write to me immediately. Such letter never reached me." I refused to publish Mr. Allen's review because it was a low vulgar tirade of abuse against the "self-constituted Committee," and not fit for the columns of any paper, and especially a religious paper. I was willing that he should reply, and told him that, if he would write a review, manly and Christian in its language and spirit I would cheerfully publish it, and so I would; but I could not consent to the admission of such an article as he furnished me.

The above quotation implies that he never received any information of the decision of the Executive Committee; or that I never laid the matter before them. Every reader will draw one of these inferences from his language. The facts are the following: the matter was laid before the Committee, and it was decided that his article could not be published. Brothers Ellis and Winebrenner both wrote to him to this effect, and *he acknowledged having received their letter*. Thus the reader will see the true character of Allen's "record of facts."

Again, he says on the same page of his History: "On the 18th of March the *Herald* contained 'the second report' of the self-constituted Committee. Of course, methought, the *Herald* will now be open for a reply. Accordingly, I prepared a brief and pointed card, to be followed by a full review of the Committee's assertions, and dispatched them at once to Dr. Schenk, of Franklin, requesting him to read them to Mr. Maple, and hasten its insertion in the paper. A few days later the article came back with the announcement that Maple would not publish it." I refused to publish this article because it was filled with hard and unchristian assertions. Its statements were clothed in the bitterest language, breathing a malicious spirit, and was unfit to be published. I informed Dr. Schenk that if Mr. Allen would prepare an article free from such bitter and unkind remarks, it should be published.

Mr. Allen neglected to record a historical fact of some importance from its connection with the history of the above

named article. When I refused to publish his card he went to Mr. J. Geary and *tried to hire him to publish it without my knowledge.* But Mr. Geary refused. The historian of Antioch College should have recorded this fact, for it throws some light on the dark pages of his history.

HE FALSELY REPORTS A MEETING.

On page 27, when speaking of the meeting of the Executive Committee held in Dayton on the 7th of April, the Historian says:

"Two of the Executive Committee insisted that Prof. Allen must not be allowed to reply at all! It would not do! Our people are already tired of the controversy! It would injure the circulation of the *Herald!* But Eld. J. Ellis and Bro. Geary finally succeeded in influencing them to allow me as above stated *three times* the space of the reports. Elder J. Ellis maintained that I ought not to be limited at all."

The above extract, and its connection, convey the idea that the two members of the Committee, who were opposed to Mr. Allen's having the use of the columns of the *Herald* to reply to the self-constituted Committee were Maple and Reeder. This is false, and Mr. Allen knew that it was not true when he wrote the above paragraph. It was Winebrenner and Reeder. I was willing that he should reply if he would write in a proper spirit. Mr. Allen says: "Eld. J. Ellis *maintained that I ought not to be limited at all.*" This is a false statement. Elder Ellis said before the Committee, and in the presence of Mr. Allen, a number of times, that he was in favor of Allen having three times the amount of space occupied by the Committee's report, "and *that there the matter must end.*" This is Bro. Ellis' language.

On page 98 Mr. Allen says: "Was it not enough for Maple and Reeder to insist that my reply should be limited, and limited to three times the space in the *Herald* occupied by the self-constituted Committee? Why must they specify the language that I must use, and the matter which I must introduce, and the manner in which I must answer the char-

ges?" We required him to be limited to the matter bearing directly on the question, and to "couch his reply in respectful language," because we had seen a sample of his style of writing in the articles that he had already prepared for the *Herald*. They were not confined to the subject, nor "couched in respectful language;" but were written in a bad spirit and "couched in" bitter and unchristian language.

HIS NEWSPAPER REVIEW.

Again on page 98, Mr. Allen says: "I prepared a manuscript review of said reports as near five columns long as I could judge, and dispatched it to Dr. Schenk, with the request that he would submit it to Eld. Maple, etc., so that it might appear in the next week's issue of the *Herald*." The article sent by Mr. Allen was of sufficient length to fill about ten columns of the *Herald*, instead of five.

On page 100 and 101 is a letter from Dr. W. L. Schenk in which it is said that I promised Dr. Schenk that the whole article should be published. This is a mistake. The facts are the following. "Dr. Schenk handed me Mr. Allen's review to read. I informed him that I had nothing to say about the matter, any farther than to confine him to the use "of respectful language;" that the committee had limited him to three times the amount of space occupied by the report of the self-constituted Committee, which I supposed would be about three columns. I read the review, and objected to some hard and uncalled for expressions. These Dr. Schenk erased. I then told him that I had no objection to publishing the review as it was, provided that it could be put in the space allowed him by the Committee. I sent it to Mr. Geary with directions to follow the instructions of the Executive Committee. I never told Dr. Schenk that I would publish the whole review whether it would go into the space allotted to Mr. Allen or not. Mr. Allen charges me with "duplicity to Dr. Schenk." This is not true. I did just what I promised Dr. Schenk that I would do.

A BASE SUPPRESSION OF FACTS.

On page 181, I. W. Allen publishes two letters, or extracts from them. One was written to Mr. Lynn and the other to Allen. On page 182, are extracts from another letter of mine bearing on the same point. In those letters the following passage occurs: "There are some things in the Committee's report on the College to which I objected, and told Mr. Mann that they must be left out, or he must not put my name to it; but notwithstanding this, he put my name to it unjustly."

The facts in regard to this matter, are the following: Hon. H. Mann came to my house with the report that he and the other members of the Committee had prepared. He read it to me. There was one thing in the address that I objected to; but after some conversation about the objectional feature I signed the report. It was left with me to send to Mr. Geary to publish. I instructed Mr. Geary to strike off a proof and send it to Mr. Mann to read. The next morning after Mr. Mann was at my house I read over the report carefully, and I then thought that the feature in it to which I had objected would do harm, and had much better be left out. I sent the report to Mr. Geary, but wrote to Mr. Mann that he had better strike out the part I objected to when he came to read the proof. He replied that he had seen Elder J. G. Reeder, and that he objected to having it left out. When I received this letter I wrote to Mr. Mann to leave the objectional feature out, or to omit my name; for I would not consent to have my name connected with the report and let the objectional features remain. Time passed, the Committee's report was published with the objectional feature somewhat changed, but in substance the same. I heard nothing from Mr. Mann for several weeks, and I thought that he had treated me "unjustly" in publishing the report as it was with my name to it. In my correspondence with Messrs. Lynn, Allen and O. J. Wait I expressed my feelings pretty freely on the matter. After

I had written to the above gentlemen I received a letter from Mr. Mann that explained the whole matter and exonerated him from all blame. He was absent lecturing in the West, when my second letter reached the Springs, and the Committee's report was published before he saw it. This set the matter right in my mind. I wrote to Brother Wait explaining the matter to him, and freeing Mr. Mann from all blame. I also explained the matter to Prof. I. W. Allen, *five months before his book was published*. But he suppresses this fact and makes use of my letters to prove what he knew to be false. I also explained the matter to Mr. J. T. Lynn. These are the facts in the case, and they free Mr. Mann from all blame in the matter.

“INDIANA” SCHEME TO RAISE AN EXCITEMENT.

On page 185 Mr. Allen, in speaking of his plan for the redemption of the College, says: “My motives were pure. My object was in a humble way, to aid in raising Antioch College from its present unhappy condition and in restoring it to its founders. The insinuation of selfish interests is malicious and unchristian.” When Mr. Allen presented his plan for the redemption of the College he urged me to publish it by every consideration that he could present; and among other things he said, “It will defeat the Franklin Stock plan if it does nothing else, and that must be done by all means.” This shows the purity of his motives. Their purity is also seen in the fact that after he had written and published the “Indiana Plan” he wrote an article for the *Gospel Herald*, advocating it, signed “Ohio,” and also another for the *Herald and Messenger*, signed “Buckeye;” and still another signed “New-York,” thus making the impression on the public mind that this plan had many advocates, where there was but one, Prof. I. W. Allen. Shall we write under these facts, “My motives were pure?”

On page 190 Mr. Allen says: “An able friend and brother communicated an excellent article to the *Gospel Herald*, of

February 11th, from which I extract." Then follows a long extract. This article is signed "Ohio," and was written by Prof. Ira W. Allen, (though I believe he got another man to copy it for him,) and yet he says: "An able friend and brother communicated, &c." Write under this fact "my motives are pure."

HIS PERSONAL INSINUATIONS.

On page 233 we read: "Indeed, reliable people have told me things concerning Mr. Maple's former character and course in life, which I could hardly believe, even after the transactions of the past twelve months. At these late zig-zag, tortuous and dark transactions they did not seem surprised! They could hardly expect better things, said they, of Mr. James Maple." Here Mr. Allen throws out dark hints, and insinuates that "Mr. James Maple" has been guilty of some terrible crimes in his past "course of life." If Mr. Allen had good authority for such statements why does he not give it? If he knew of such black crimes why did he not publish them? Those who have read his book and seen with what industry he has hunted up everything that he could by any possible amount of twisting and false statements convert into an instrument of persecution to injure those who have opposed him in his "late zig-zag, tortuous and dark transactions of the past" three years will not very readily believe, that if he had known anything against me so dark as he insinuates, that he would have kept it out of his book. The spirit and language of his book shows that he would have rejoiced over such facts, and made the most of them that he could. The truth is he knew of nothing, and his slanderous insinuations are without any foundation in fact. I am willing that he may publish all the facts about me that he can gleam from my "past course of life;" but I want him to confine himself to facts, and not throw out insinuations that he knows are false. I am willing that Mr. Allen, or any other person, may "take a look at my antecedents."

Mr. Allen says on page 233: "We deeply regret that Mr. Maple had not stamina sufficient to keep him erect, not only on his own account, but on account of the tarnished honor of the Connection." We assure Mr. Allen that our "stamina" has been sufficient to keep us true to our conviction of truth. We were led astray from the proper course that we should have taken concerning the College, by the false statements of Messrs. Allen and Doherty; but we soon learned the facts in the case, and had "stamina sufficient" to follow the truth, though it did call down on our humble head the thunders of Prof. Allen, the self-styled embodiment of denominational purity and zeal. We think, however, that we shall out-live the storm; and yet see the time when Mr. Allen will be ashamed that he ever wrote a "History of Antioch College."

On page 236 Mr. Allen thus dismisses Mr. Maple: "Over numerous other statements and acts of Mr. Maple, we pass in silence, for the present, and we hope forever." It is our humble opinion that Mr. Allen could have been much better employed than in writing what he has about "Mr. Maple;" and we think it would have been to his credit if he had been careful to have stated nothing but the truth about "Mr. Maple."

The History of Antioch College is a remarkable book. It was conceived in an unfortunate spirit, and manifests a malignant disposition. It will confirm the prejudices of some, furnish a text-book for our enemies; but it will soon pass silently into that oblivious receptacle of things, "Abortive, monstrous, or unkindly mixed," described by Milton:

"All these, up-whirled aloft,
Flew o'er the backside of the world, far off,
Into a limbo large and wide, since called
The Paradise of Fools—to few unknown
Long after.—"

Franklin, O., May, 1859.

JAMES MAPLE.

MR. FESSENDEN'S STATEMENT.

I find my name in Mr. Ira W. Allen's so-called "History among those whom he has done the honor to abuse. As his book shows so evidently that the whole object of this abuse is to retaliate upon me for having testified to some things which I knew of him, before the Committee which came here to examine the reasons of his not being appointed again on the Faculty, and as the most of it consists of low and spiteful personalities I propose to give it but little notice. As to the testimony given before that Committee, it is true, and no amount of personal abuse can invalidate it. To the most material part of it, a third person (Prof. Weston) was witness, whose recollection of the case entirely corroborates my statement.

To all that he says on pp. 151 and 152 about my hoping that if any sayings or doings respecting myself should come to his knowledge he would communicate them to me;—about my informing him that Mr. Mann was not my friend; and about his giving me his friendship and to some extent his trust;—I have only to say that I never expressed to him such a desire, and never gave him such information. But the contrary *is* true. He did make precisely such a proposition to me, and proposed in turn to keep me informed if any thing was done or said about me. And accordingly *he told me* that Mr. Mann was not my friend, but a secret enemy. He told me many things both of a general and specific nature to make me believe it, and one time made quite an impression on my mind that such was really the case. But I subsequently found that he was deceiving me both as to general spirit and specific acts. I could name cases in which he gave me reports positively false, as I afterwards learned from

disinterested persons, of action taken in the Faculty in matters pertaining to my interest, in order to convince me that Mr. Mann was my enemy and himself my special friend. It was in this way that "he gave me his friendship and to some extent his trust."

He was quite communicative to me, as may be inferred from his own statements. Why it was, I cannot tell, unless he thought I would second him in his designs. He told me many of his plans and purposes what he had power to do, and what he expected to accomplish. From what I gathered from him in these frequent interviews, I came to the following conclusions:

Mr. I. W. Allen looked forward to the Presidency of Antioch College. In order to accomplish this end, a party was formed of certain individuals, of which he was the nucleus, and the object of which was to criticise, find fault, and do and say what would undermine the character of Mr. Mann and eventually to get him removed. At a fitting time the name of Mr. Allen was to be brought forward as a candidate for President, with the expectation of success. The consummation of this was to be brought about at the regular Trustee's meeting in 1857, but the assignment frustrated his plans.

My reasons for coming to the above conclusions are the following:

1. The knowledge I had of the meeting and conversation of such individuals.
2. The tenor of Mr. Allen's conversations with me as above described.
3. The frequent more direct and positive assertions made by Mr. Allen to me. For instance:

In a certain interview with Mr. Allen he held out, as a reason why I should go with him, that he was able to support me, that he had influence and power enough among the Trustees to protect me, and would do it; but if I was not careful there would be an influence brought to bear against me more powerful than Mr. Mann's, for as sure as the sun

shone, the College would be wrested from the hands of Mr. Mann, and then, where would his influence be?

At another time when he began to suspect that my confidence in him was wavering, I met him near Mr. Mann's house. In a short interview, he tried to re-assure me of his strength and power; telling me that he had had interviews with many of the Trustees and he knew their feelings in regard to Mr. Mann; that Mr. Mann thought he was on a sure foundation, but he was very much deceived; that there were certain charges which he (Allen) could furnish which would be sufficient to get him removed; and if Mr. Mann was not careful what he did and what he said, he would come down upon him; that he had the means in his hands, and was only waiting for a quarrel, when, at the next Trustees' meeting, he could get him discharged. Yet all this time he was conducting himself to Mr. Mann's face with smiles and suavity.

These were not the only conversations of a similar character, which he had with me. As he says, they were "frequent."

4. My fourth reason for these conclusions is a conversation with Mr. A. M. Merrifield, who was Mr. Allen's confidential, bosom friend, then boarding at his house. In a conversation at my house on College affairs, Mr. M. said that there would probably be a change in the President's Chair. Not that he had personally any objection to Mr. Mann's *educational abilities*, but there were objections from various sources, and Mr. Mann was not the man for the place. He said there was but one man in the Christian denomination who was sufficiently well qualified in every respect to fill the place, and that was Ira W. Allen; that he was growing in popularity both with the students and abroad, as he (Merrifield) personally knew. This conversation took place in the presence of Mrs. Fessenden.

Circumstances coming to my knowledge from other sources also confirmed my convictions.

On p. 152 Mr. Allen speaks of an effort made against me

in a meeting of the Trustees, which he says exhibited a determination to remove me from the College. He says:

“On leaving the meeting to go down town, I met Mr. F. coming up near Mr. Mann’s house, and told him what was going on in the meeting of the Board, remarking that it was surprising to me that Mr. Mann should sit and allow Dean and Blake (his relatives by marriage) to go on in that style against him, (Mr. F.) when a word from his (Mann’s) mouth would make them whist; that if Mr. Mann was truly his friend he would I thought defend him; and advising him to be on his guard, I passed on.”

This extract is calculated to leave in the mind of the reader the impression which he intended to make upon me, namely, that Mr. Mann, by silence, consented to and favored the scheme. Mr. Allen did make the above remarks to me, but these are not all. He also said that he had no doubt that Mr. Mann was at the bottom of it, and the others were only acting as his tools. He said it was a plan of Mr. Mann to get me out.

But the fact was, Mr. Mann was the first who informed me that any such thing was to be attempted, and told me to prepare a statement and he would have it presented to the Trustees and would see that I had justice done me. This was before Mr. Allen had made these insinuations. Soon after Mr. Mann had spoken to me, Prof. Pennell came to me, also, telling me the same thing and making the same suggestion. I followed their advice. Mr. Mann took my part in the meeting, and it is to his faithfulness to me and his early notice of the movement tenfold more than to Mr. Allen that I am indebted for being so triumphantly sustained.

The facts connected with this case had a leading and most decided influence in convincing me that Mr. Allen had been deceiving me. His own report of his language to me shows (which was true) that he was endeavoring to keep me under the conviction that Mr. Mann was an enemy to me. I was greatly surprised, therefore, when Mr. Mann came to

me, giving me that information and advice, and proffering his aid. I hardly knew whether to believe that he was acting truly, and that Mr. Allen had been deceiving me, or that Mr. Allen had told me the truth and that Mr. Mann and Mr. Pennell were both acting a deceitful part now. One or other must be true. I met Mr. Weston and stated the case to him, and asked him what he thought. He replied that, whatever he might think of Mr. Allen, he did not think Mr. Mann or Mr. Pennell capable of acting so deceitful a part in the case. I told him there must be great deceit on one side or the other, and I was at a loss to know which, and loth to believe either. We concluded it best to say nothing about it, but watch the movements of both parties, and time would decide the question. It has decided it to my utmost satisfaction.

On p. 153 Mr. Allen gives his description of an interview between Mr. Mann and myself, in which he says Mr. Mann "pounced upon" me, &c. Now if this had been true, how could *he* know it? Was he present? He does not pretend it. It is all really and evidently false. The fact is this:

In a certain interview between Mr. Mann and myself, in the course of the conversation, Mr. Mann, induced by some cause unknown to me, asked me directly and as though he was well assured of the fact, if Prof. Allen had been saying things to me unfavorable to him (Mr. Mann) and to prejudice me against him. The facts in the case and the form of the question were such that I could not have given him an evasive answer if I had desired; and I told him he had. After a little pause, Mr. Mann said, "Can it be possible that Mr. Allen can so forfeit his word? He has promised me, on his word and honor, that if he had anything unfavorable to say in regard to me he would first come to me, and would never speak or write anything derogatory to me till he had done so." He said he must see Mr. Allen about it, if I had no objections. I told him I had none whatever.

After leaving Mr. Mann I reflected that there had been no witness to the conversation between Mr. Allen and myself, and if he should deny what he had said, I could not prove it. I resolved to have an interview with Allen in the presence of a witness. This led me to see Mr. Weston, in whose judgment I had confidence, and to communicate the above fact to him, and to ask his advice. The result was the interview and conversation with Mr. Allen, a true and correct statement of which Mr. Weston has read to me and will give to the public.

The assertion on page 156 that I "was stoutly opposed to Mr. Fay's becoming pastor of Christian Church in this place," is untrue. I was in favor of him and voted for him, as is well known.

It is said, on p. 157, "He (myself) said in a store in this town, in the presence of several persons, that *he (I) should not dare to oppose Horace Mann, for his bread and butter depended on him!*"

Of all the slang which he has used against me to invalidate the force of my testimony, this is the only thing which would have the least weight if it were true; and *this is false!* I never made such a remark; and he cannot find a single truthful man who will say that he was one of "several persons" who heard me say it. I am not that kind of a man. But it is not strange that a man whose life as well as word, (see p. 113) expresses that "a \$1000 per year and a Professorship for life are worth struggling for," should be forward with such a suspicion.

THE MELODEON STORY.

On p. 59 of his "Church History" he says: "On the 12th of February, towards evening, William M. King, and M. Harrington, broke into the Chapel, when L. G. Fessenden, S. M. Davis, [Lewis,] Birch and sons, Twist and others, came in, and taking possession of a large melodeon used by the choir, carried it away."

By this he evidently designs to make his readers believe that the Chapel was feloniously broken into, that the melodeon belonged to the choir; that it was taken possession of (stolen) by persons who had no interest in it; and that I was a party to the transaction. These four statements are four falsehoods; as was shown before Conference's Committee of investigation, and as can be shown again by any reasonable amount of evidence. The house was not entered in any unusual way, as was proved as above; the choir had no interest in the melodeon, except the conditional privilege of using it, granted by the owners; and those who took possession of it were the owners themselves.

That I was not there at that time and had nothing whatever to do with the removal of it, can be proved by all who were present.

The melodeon belonged to a Young People's Association, and the use of it was granted to the choir on certain conditions. The control of it was in the hands of a Committee of five. The pastor of the Church, Mr. Fay, was on leave of absence attending to College business; there had been no Sabbath service for several weeks; the Chapel was said to have changed proprietors; the melodeon was of no use there and was getting damaged. Under these circumstances the Committee thought it best to remove it. Three of the five signed an order for its removal, and the others both approved the act. One of them was then out of town; the other, Mr. A. L. Allen, brother of Ira W., authorized me to say that he approved the act and should have signed the order if he had been asked. The melodeon was for months in the house of Mr. Allen, was there when he wrote the book. So, if the instrument was stolen, he was a receiver of the stolen goods, and the crime was upon him at the time. But the crime was not in the *re*-ception, but in the *de*-ception.

The melodeon has since been sold by the same Committee, and the proceeds, by unanimous agreement, devoted to Antioch College Library.

Mr. Allen took it very ill at the time the melodeon was

moved. He imagined that, having a pretense to a title to a piece of real estate, all the personal property,—melodeon, Sunday School library and all—belonged to him, also. The following certificate from Mr Myron Haight, shows with what temper he took the announcement that the committee had taken possession of their own property.

“Yellow Springs, O., June 22d, 1859.

“In Feb. 1858, the day on which the melodeon was removed from the Christian Chapel, Mr. Ira W. Allen said in my presence in relation to those who removed it, that, if he had been there he would have split their heads open; at the same time exhibiting a large hickory cane he held in his hand.

[Signed,]

MYRON HAIGHT.”

His friend and co-trustee, Mr. J. A. Layton, was even more enraged than he, as his threats to me and also to Mr. Craig, about pistols and shooting plainly show.

Let the parents of the Christian denomination consider whether a man who exhibits such a temper and disposition and who will, months after, in cool deliberation, publish such falsehoods, is a man to whom they would wish to entrust the care and education of their children!

L. G. FESSENDEN.

Yellow Springs. June, 1856.

ELDER SIMONTON'S STATEMENT.

I am desired to make a statement in reference to that "*History of Antioch College,*" by Prof. Allen. I can only speak of that portion of it which has reference to myself.

In the first place, Prof. Allen wrote to me *stating certain points he desired* me to answer. I did not answer him at the time; but soon after I met him in Troy, when he urged that I should make a statement in writing and send it to him at the Springs. I did not think at the time that I was sending it to publish in a book, or in any other form; I think he has done me great injustice in making the use of it that he has without my consent.

Secondly, he puts words *into my mouth* and takes them out again, and sends them to the world, *that I never said to him, nor any other man.* Is this just, between those who are brethren in more than one sense of that term? He makes me say that Mr. Fay flattered and hoodwinked McWhinney until the encrustations of *soft solder* became so thick that he (Mr. W.) could not see out;" and that he (Mr. Fay) attempted to varnish me over in the same way, by telling me that my "*influence was great and potent with the Christians, &c., and if two such distinguished men as yourself and McWhinney come over to the College, and hear my 'reasons,' and then publish a 'report' with your names appended, it will set College affairs all right with our churches.*" This Mr. Fay never said to me, neither did I say it to Mr. Allen. *The first I ever heard of such talk was in Mr. Allen's book.*

Mr. Allen questioned me on these points, and I told him at the time as near as I could remember what Mr. Fay said to me; which I will here state. Mr. Fay said "they wanted to select men that the churches knew, men in whom they had

confidence; that I had been raised here in the west, and that a statement from me and others named would have more influence than it would coming from strangers," in all of which there is neither '*soft solder*' nor '*fulsome praise*.' I did not think that Mr. Fay was the man that Mr. Allen would have us believe him; hence I had more good sense than to tell Mr. A. any such *stuff*.

It appears, too, that as soon as Mr. Allen learned that my '*great and potent influence*' with the Church was on the side of redeeming the College on the plan before the people, he could not be content without giving me a blow, when at the same time, I had never said a word against him; but had been his friend. In striking at the College he must include all its friends. And as he considered '*Mann, Fay & Co.*' at the head of all the corruption presented in his book, he comes to the sage, Allen-like conclusion, that the '*insidious influence of Mann, Fay, & Co., have, we fear, swerved even Bro. Simonton from the straight way, and blinded even his eyes to the truth.*' 'Do not his numerous and lengthy articles, *so far as they have any point, indicate this.*' *Do say!* His articles were written under the '*insidious influence of Mann, Fay & Co.!*

I will here inform Mr. Allen and all concerned, that Mr. Mann Fay & Co., have never had me '*under their insidious influence,* neither has Mr. Allen; though I think he would have been much pleased had it been so. But I have a mind of my own and I intend to use it.

Mr. Mann, Fay & Co. have never made an effort to ring me in and blind my mind to the truth. But Mr. Allen would be glad to convince the Churches among whom I have been preaching over twenty years that this is even so. And to make the matter appear in the most unfavorable light, he says, "Mr. Mann, has *Antioch College under one thumb,* and several of the *blustering Christian Ministers under the other.*" Reader, mark the word,—*blustering Christian Ministers.* He here makes a thrust at Christian Ministers, who had by their devotion to the cause of truth, earned a good name

among men before he had left the fostering care of his good old father and mother. This does not come with a very good grace from a young man of but yesterday among us, when it is applied to men who have spent the best of their days in the defence of truth.

I have written these few lines to defend truth, and justice. I care but little about what has been said about me. If permitted to live, I can outlive all that has been said, and more too, if it may be said.

I have always believed Mr. Mann to be a Christian gentleman of a high intellectual order, well qualified for the position he holds; and I have no desire to see him removed, until I have good and substantial reasons for changing my mind. I regret that circumstances have made it my duty to make these statements, but I have only told the simple truth, so far as I am concerned.

New Carlisle, March 21, 1859.

H. SIMONTON.

VOLUNTARY STATEMENTS OF THE FIRST GRADUATING CLASS.

Among the few true things in Mr. Allen's book are his statements on page 75, concerning the members of the class of '57,—the first graduating class. His remark shows that the members of that class had no special ill-will toward him, and that they were persons of fair character and good judgment. This class knew Mr. Allen longer than any other class did. He himself shows (page 20) that he was their teacher both in Mathematics and German. He had ample opportunity to pour out to this class all the "love and poetry" of his youthful heart. Though his characteristic modesty would doubtless shrink from public commendation, perhaps he will permit this class, under his present very peculiar circumstances, to disregard his wishes for once, and to make known to the world the sentiment with which he has inspired them, and the deep impressions made upon them by his scholarship and character.

A single letter, as brief as could be written, was sent to each member of this class, asking his opinion of Mr. Allen as a teacher and as a man, and asking whether Mr. Mann ever tried to induce him to take other studies instead of Mathematics, as Mr. Allen charged. To the latter question they replied with a unanimous and indignant *No!* They affirmed that Mr. Mann repeatedly induced them to take the mathematics, much against their will, and, as they believe, to their detriment.

These members of the class, (Mr. Yeoman, Mr. Robinson, and A. M. Weston,) have never responded to the letter sent, probably never having received it. Their opinion, however,

is well known; and in no respect differs from that of their classmates.

Four other members of the class (Mr. J. B. Weston, Mr. Badger, and Mr. and Mrs. Eli Jay,) are debarred from testifying: since they live at Yellow Springs, three of them as teachers in the College. Their testimony, though stronger than that of the others, is withheld; since it might be supposed that they share in this community's detestation of Mr. Allen's mendacious course.

The testimony of the other members of this class is subjoined. Remember, these are mature persons. They knew Mr. Allen three years. Many of them were at the College longer than he was. They saw his course from the beginning to the end. They came in contact with him much more than with any other teacher. They knew him better than any other class did. They send their letters from remote states, and even from different continents. There was no chance for interchange of opinion. They have not been back to the College since they and Mr. Allen left. Their opinions are sent in answer to the simple question, "What is your opinion of Mr. Allen as a teacher and as a man?" Their opinions are deliberate. It is nearly two years, since these persons graduated. They have certainly had time to reflect as to whether the opinions they held did Mr. Allen injustice. Besides, they have Mr. Allen's public endorsement that "for high scholarship and thorough discipline they would have done honor to the oldest colleges in the land."

Note, that these statements are those of responsible persons, holding many of them important public positions. One of them is the testimony of a dying man, the signature appended to it being the last his hand ever made. Note, that while these opinions differ in the estimate put on Mr. Allen as a *teacher*, they are unanimous in their opinion of him as a *man*. On this last head some have declined to speak, desiring to say nothing of a man when they could say nothing good. But the testimony, as far as it goes, is a unit; and

it goes far enough to convince any mind that the opinion thus concurred in by a dozen persons, in different parts of the world, cannot be without foundation. The following speak for themselves.

Mr. Newell Tibbetts, the best mathematician of the class, writes as follows:

"As a teacher I considered him superficial, mechanical, and governed entirely by numbers and formulæ instead of the principles or subject of the instruction!"

Miss Achsah E. Waite, a lady teacher of whom you will hear honorable mention made in Chicago, says:—

"In mathematics, I did not like him at all: and if his management of our class was a fair specimen of his manner of teaching the sciences generally, I must consider him somewhat below my standard, &c. &c."

C. F. Childs, a prominent teacher in St. Louis, says:—"I do not wish to say anything against Mr. Allen either as a man or as a teacher. He labored hard to do well by our class. That he had many faults and lacked many of the qualifications of his position, none can deny. * * * * *

"The slanderer's course is short. A fish on dry land makes a great fuss; but let him alone, and he will die himself."

Mr. C. V. Clemons, a mature and candid man, and now a member of the medical profession, writes as follows:—

"My opinion of Prof. Allen as a *teacher* was not very favorable. That his educational qualifications were sufficient I did not doubt; but his characteristic *hauteur*, and lack of all the essential elements that go to make up the agreeable, gentlemanly teacher, would in my opinion, totally disqualify him for being a successful and popular teacher. As a *man*, my opinion is still more unfortunate. He was sensitively suspicious, and ambitiously if not treacherously selfish; and his sympathy, like his friendship, sometimes demonstrative, was always *forced*. I have often thought him a petty Wallenstein, but with very few of the noble traits of Schiller's hero. Such is my opinion of Prof. Allen, and un-

favorable as it is, I do assure him and his opponents alike, that what I have said has not been "set down in malice," but with the most grateful remembrance of his uniform but studied kindness toward myself."

Mr. Frank S. Curtis, a young gentleman rapidly rising to eminence at the Chicago bar, writes:—

"As a teacher I was very much pleased with him (Allen,) but as a man I was not. I am in no wise prejudiced against Mr. Allen; yet as a man of honor and true moral character, I think him quite deficient. I believe him to be quite deceitful and hypocritical, both socially and religiously; and I know that he will violate his word, and to my certain knowledge did, to satisfy a little revenge."

Prof. N. Fellows, a gentleman well known in the South, and a keen judge of human nature, says:—

"My opinion of Mr. I. W. Allen as a teacher is no secret among my friends. I have always considered him as incompetent to impart instruction in any *respectable college*; and, from his general obtuseness on the subject of human nature, only moderately qualified for a leading position in a Union School.

"As a *man* I am not conscious that he enjoys a very large store of my affection. Still, I would do him no injustice; nor have I ever denied him the possession of certain abilities; though I am free to confess that I have failed to discover in him any *remarkable* powers, except, perhaps, those of digestion, secretion and assimilation, for which, in my judgment, he is unsurpassed by any College Professor in the Union.

"In concluding this note I would hereby take occasion to thank you and my friends for the opportunity of expressing my contempt for the self-conceited numb-skull, who, by falsehood, by repeated slanders and base insinuations, has sought and is seeking to undermine a man whose lofty character and brilliant genius are as much above Allen's

capacity of *appreciating* them, even, as the Brain is above the Diaphragm."

R. G. Horr, Esq., who was held in such estimation by his fellow citizens as to be elected County Clerk of Loraine Co., immediately after his graduation, writes as follows:—

"To give you in full my opinion of him as a teacher and a man would be to furnish a sad chapter on the meanness of human nature when depraved and perverted. As a teacher, he is cold, formal, stiff, with limited powers of explanation, frequently thick-headed and often overbearing and insulting.

"His knowledge is wholly confined to what he has gathered from books. I do not remember of his ever having exhibited the faintest glimmer of originality. But perhaps his greatest defect as a teacher lies in his entire destitution of those qualities which make pupils esteem and love a teacher. During the two years I was at Antioch, I never heard a single word of affection dropped in his favor.

"As a man, his case is still worse. His most remarkable intellectual quality is unbounded egotism; which, combined with what he considers "foreign manners," renders him a laughing stock to men of sense.

"For a man of his age, his bearing cannot but be disgusting to all people of intelligence. But, with all his faults, did he but possess unyielding integrity, he would be still endurable. But when you come to add to his superciliousness a back-biting disposition, coupled with sordid selfishness and sneaking treachery, you have Prof. Allen with his glasses off.

"I do not know of a man who seems to me more devoted to self, who possesses so little regard for the good of others. I have no hesitation in saying that I have no confidence in his integrity, when self-aggrandizement is his object, and that covers a vast deal of time in his case."

Miss Ada Shepard was Mr. Allen's teacher in French, and knew him intimately. Since his disappointment (as Profes-

sor) she has been travelling in Europe. She writes from Rome as follows:—

“As a teacher, I never admired him, and very soon became entirely dissatisfied with him. His qualifications were decidedly insufficient for a Professor in a college. Morally I consider him a *dangerous* person to hold a position as an educator of youth. I *know* him to be slanderous, deceitful, and entirely untrustworthy.”

As these were given with the permission to use them publicly, they are submitted as the kind of endorsement which the First Graduating Class of Antioch College gives to Mr. I. W. Allen.

H. C. BADGER.

REJOINDER TO CHURCH HISTORY.

As a fitting accompaniment of his College History, Mr. Allen has published what he calls a "History of the Christian Church of Yellow Springs." Of this Mr. Allen is well known to be the author, though the names of other men are appended to it. The aim of it is of a piece with that of his so-called History of Antioch College, namely, to throw reproach upon the friends of the College and of the First Christian Church, and to give the impression to the public that they had committed gross wrongs, and that the First Church was now an extinct organization.

It is very proper that an attack upon the College and an attack on the First Christian Church should be put in the same book. Their interests are the same, and the attacks upon them have the same origin, the same spirit and the same end. They are associated together by Mr. Allen and in the minds of the public. A vindication of the Church, therefore, is equally a vindication of the College.

The best answer to all his tissue of untrue assertions and allegations is the report of a Committee appointed by the Miami Christian Conference to come to Yellow Springs and investigate the matters at issue between the Churches.

This Committee consisted of Eld. Josiah Knight, Eld. ——— Emrick, and Brothers Elias Smith, John Van Mater and Jesse Demint. These were all of them men widely known for their candor and sound judgment. They all lived remote from Yellow Springs, were in no

way connected with its local affairs, and were of minds unbiased and disinterested. Elder Emrick did not meet with the Committee, but the other four met on the 8th day of March, and gave three days and a half to a "patient and impartial investigation of the whole matter." Mr. Allen's party (that of the Second Church), employed a lawyer to assist them in the trial, and everything possible was done to substantiate there, what Mr. Allen had alleged in his book. Numbers of that party had a copy of his book in their hands during the meetings, though not one was seen with a Bible.

The report of that Committee, as given to the public through the columns of the Gospel Herald, is a complete refutation of all the principal points which Mr. Allen makes in his so-called history. It triumphantly acquits the First Church and its friends of the charges which he prefers; and not only shows his book to be utterly false, but also shows his party, of which he is the moving spirit, to be guilty of "deep laid plans" and fraudulent transactions, such as no man of business could commit and be tolerated for a moment as an honest man.

And here let us call attention to the fact that every examination of affairs belonging to the College has resulted in the same way. Our enemies work by slander-ing us abroad and where we can not meet them; but on every investigation, whether by committees or individual men, we have been uniformly and triumphantly sustained. And the friends of Antioch College, and of the First Christian Church, stand ready at any time, and all times, to meet any impartial man of intelligence, or any committee impartially appointed, to confront and be confronted by their accusers; to have a full and fair investigation of facts on any point wherein they are accused, and to abide the verdict. Can the world ask more?

We give the report entire.

“ COMMITTEE’S REPORT.

“ The Committee appointed by the Miami Christian Conference at its last session to investigate the cause of trouble in the two Christian Churches at Yellow Springs, Greene County, Ohio, would respectfully submit the following

“ REPORT.

“ Pursuant to appointment, your Committee met at Yellow Springs, Feb. 8, 1859, and on being informed that the parties were not ready for the investigation of the affair, your Committee recommended the parties to make an effort to settle the whole affair by mutual consultation. This proved a failure, and the 8th of March was appointed for the investigation to take place, at which time, the Committee met the parties in the basement of the Christian Meeting-house in Yellow Springs, and the following is the result of three-and-a-half days of patient and impartial investigation of the whole matter.

“ Your Committee believe that they have entered upon, and pursued the duties of their appointment with unprejudiced minds, and be assured that they have not attended to their duty in a careless, or indifferent manner, for scarcely could a case involve greater responsibility, even were life and death pending. The dearest interests of the Christian cause, not only at Yellow Springs, and in the Miami Conference, but the entire Christian Church, east, west, north and south, are involved. In making their report, the Committee have studiously avoided per-

sonalities, thinking if names should hereafter be called for, they could be furnished at some future time better than in connection with this report.

“The following specifications were presented by the First Church against the Second Church.

“First:—‘That an attempt, unwarranted by any usage, schismatic and contrary to the spirit of the New Testament, was made to dissolve the First Christian Church in Yellow Springs, by persons who immediately after said attempt, became members of said Second Church, and who, with others in the interest of said Second Church, were then conspiring for the destruction of said First Church, and which attempt was accompanied by a series of acts designed to accomplish an unlawful end by unlawful means.’

Second:—“That the records of the said First Christian Church, though lawfully demanded, were, and still are, unlawfully detained by a person or persons who were members of said Second Church, or were co-operating to promote its interests.”

Third:—“That in furtherance of their purpose of dispersing and breaking up said First Church, the property which had been long used, and was supposed to belong to the same, was unwarrantably and clandestinely disposed of for the benefit of the Second Church, notwithstanding terms far more favorable were offered for the same in behalf of the First Church.

Fourth:—“That said Second Church locked the children of the Sunday School, belonging to the First Church, out of the building, where they had always rightfully been accustomed to meet, locking their books and other property in, and retained the same, and still retain the same, against law and justice, and that they afterwards

repelled all mediation and attempts toward reconciliation.”

Fifth:—“That said Second Church have received and still retain in their fellowship, members who menace violence against peaceable and unoffending citizens, walk disorderly and with profane life and conversation.”

In reference to the first and third specifications, (as they are intimately connected,) it was clearly shown in evidence that such an attempt was made by persons who soon became members of the Second Church.

It was further proved to the satisfaction of the Committee, that a deep laid plan had been matured, to organize a new church, to whom the First Church property might be deeded, then to dissolve the First Church, and as many go over to the Second Church as would comply with their measures; but a large number must necessarily remain in the First Church, to convey the Church property to the new organization. The new church was secretly organized, January 22d, 1858.

The next day, Jan. 23d, at a public meeting held for the purpose of raising money to pay off the debt on the house, a resolution which was passed at a previous meeting for the same purpose, was rescinded, and a resolution passed to sell the house to the best advantage, and at as early a day as practicable, with the understanding that when it should be sold, the Church should have an opportunity to purchase it, provided they would pay as much as any other party; but instead of this understanding being carried out, on the evening of the same day (Jan. 23d, 1858,) the deed was made out, signed, sealed and delivered.

Five days later, at an adjourned meeting, the *Trustees*

reported progress in the sale of the house, when in fact the property had already been conveyed.

About this time, the friends of the Second Church party applied to the court at Xenia, for an order to sell the house, but failing to obtain said order, in consequence of objections made by the First Church, and to avoid a reversionary interest in said property, it became necessary to dissolve the First Church.

Accordingly, on the 9th of Feb., 1858, an attempt was made to dissolve the First Church. Promptitude was enjoined by the leaders, upon those who were to act in the affair. In order to enlist a larger number to embark in the enterprise, they were secretly told that an effort was to be made to disband the Church, and that such an event would produce a happier state of things at Yellow Springs. Thus prompted, all were ready at an early moment, to organize and proceed to business.

No public notice had been given of an intention to disorganize the Church, yet in the midst of remonstrances against such proceedings, it was declared by the Chairman to be dissolved.

“Now it is the opinion of your Committee, that a church may dissolve itself by a vote where there is no objection, but if a small minority is opposed to the measure, it cannot legally be dissolved. If a portion of a family become dissatisfied with a house they live in, they are at liberty to go out, and leave it, but have no right to set it on fire, or tear it down, and deprive the other members of a home; so those who were dissatisfied with the Church, had an undoubted right to withdraw peaceably, and leave the other members to themselves. If such a course to disband a church was tolerated and should gain precedence, no church upon earth would be safe.

“They would be liable to have their rights taken from

them at any time. Your Committee do not wish to be understood that all those who compose the Second Church intended to be factious or schismatic, but being influenced by the leader or leaders were led into a very unjustifiable course.

“The charges contained in the second specification, your Committee find, from the evidence, fully sustained, and therefore, in their opinion the records rightfully belong to the First Church.

“The charges contained in the fourth specification, your Committee find true, from the evidence adduced.

“In reference to the charges contained in the fifth specification, your Committee find from the evidence that some two members of the Second Church had, when unduly excited, used profane language, and that one of them had on one occasion, when very much excited, assumed a menancing attitude towards some member or members of the First Church, but it is the opinion of your Committee that this is not the general character of those members. Your Committee would further state that from the evidence, they believe that the character of the members of the Second Church is generally good.

DEFENSE.

“In justice to the Second Church, your Committee will now state the grounds of their defense. They claimed in justification of their course, that a heavy debt was hanging over the Church property, and that plan after plan had been proposed by which to raise the money to pay said debt, and that all had failed, and were likely still to fail, with the exception of the plan to sell or rent the pews. To this plan, however, the Second Church party took exception, on the ground that it disfranchised,

at least a portion of the Church members; first, in the case of poor members, who were unable to own or rent a pew, and second, in case of two or more members belonging to one family and occupying the same pew, only one of those members would be allowed to vote in electing a Pastor. They also objected to the whole congregation voting in the election of Pastor. They had no objection to renting the pews annually to raise money to pay the Pastor's salary, but could not submit to what they were pleased to call tyranny. They claimed that these were conflicting elements in the Church that could not be harmonized. The above objections or defense may palliate in some instances, but cannot, in the opinion of your Committee, justify the course pursued by the Second Church. In reference to the election of Pastor, or in transacting the business of the Church, your Committee do not wish to dictate, but give it as their opinion, that church members only, should be allowed to vote. In the opinion of your Committee, there is not difference enough in the elements incorporated in the two Churches at Yellow Springs, to justify the existence of more than one Church. We would, therefore, respectfully recommend that the two parties respectively, yield those points of difference which exist between them, and unite in one Church. In conclusion, permit us to say to you, (Brethren at Yellow Springs) for the sake of your own enjoyment—for the sake of peace at Yellow Springs, and for the sake of our holy religion and its Divine Author, we "exhort you to attend to that which makes for peace whereby one may edify another."

All of which is respectfully submitted.

JOSIAH KNIGHT,
ELIAS SMITH,
JESSE DEMINT,
JOHN VAN MATER.

We would be glad to give a full synopsis of the testimony on which this report is based, and which goes to show, in the light of an impartial investigation, the character of the transactions referred to, and especially of the man who conceived the plan and engineered it through, but circumstances forbid. We shall state some of the evidence, and state a few of the points proved, and leave it. And first we introduce the testimony of Elder James Maple.

This was presented to the Committee in an affidavit from, Br. Maple, and was read to them, and put on file among their papers; but when they came to look for it again, it *could not be found*, and they never saw it again!

WHO TOOK IT? We hope nobody took it intentionally. But the facts named in the second and fourth specifications give good ground for suspicion.

But we have obtained from Br. Maple a re-statement of the leading points given in his affidavit. He says:

“Professor W. H. Doherty informed me of the object that the men engaged in organizing the Second Church at Yellow Springs, had in view. In a letter dated January 22d, 1858, he says: ‘The first indispensable step is to exclude the odious clique now dominant, from all rule here, and to *fit a clean and plain* denominational basis of action.’ In a letter dated Jan. 28th, 1858, he says: ‘The vile, lying, and greedy clique* that have seized this place, must be sent *home first*, and perhaps Allen’s plan may be carried out. *For God’s sake beware*

* Compare this language with that of Mr. Doherty’s article of Aug. 13th, 1857, which Mr. Allen falsely attributes to Maple, and constantly throws in his face. Are such men true “representatives of the Christian denomination?”

of treachery and deceit.' The italics are Mr. Doherty's; he is speaking in the above quotations of Messrs. Mann, Craig, Weston, and the teachers then in the College.

"Mr. I. W. Allen said that the Church was organized privately, at the house of Elder D. F. Ladley; that the organization was composed of persons who were not members of the First Church; that this was necessary, in order to get possession of the Chapel; that if any who were members of the First Church went into the organization, the law would recognize them as schismatics, and then they could not get legal possession of the Chapel; that after they got the Chapel in their possession, then all that they wanted of the First Church would join them."

Mr. Maple testified also, that Mr. Allen told him that he worked day and night for two weeks, to accomplish what was done in organizing the Second Church, and getting possession of the property. He revealed to him that the object was to throw those who were connected with the College out of any connection with a Christian Church; to repudiate them publicly, by vote of the Second Church, and prevent the "Stafford [N. Y.] Convention," to be held in March, from concurring with measures already instituted in Ohio, for the redemption of the College.

Mr. Doherty expressed to him afterward that he thought this one of the most important steps ever taken in the Christian denomination.

That such was the object of the movement, was learned in town by Mr. Fessenden, and communicated by him to Mr. Mann, Mr. Fay and Mr. Weston, several days before, but they would not credit the report. The suspicion was soon confirmed by letters from Mr. Maple; but the

thing seemed to be so atrocious, that they could not believe it, till facts compelled them. The awaking of these suspicions was the cause of the change in Mr. Fay's movements, which Mr. Allen denounces, pages 42—43.

This shows that the "unlawful end" was to defeat the measures then in operation, to secure the College to the denomination, to have Mr. Mann and the existing Faculty deposed; and, evidently, to institute new measures to secure the College to Mr. I. W. Allen, to break down the only Christian Church then existing in the place, to privately organize a new Church; to get clandestine possession of the property, and to denounce, repudiate, and "send home" 'Messrs. Mann, Craig, Weston, Fay, and the teachers then in the College.'

All this was substantiated by abundance of corroborative proof, through an examination of three days, of three long sessions each; and substantiated as having been planned and urged through by Mr. Allen.

It was shown before the Committee that the plan for raising money by subscription was favored by persons now belonging to both parties, and one of the members of the (now) First Church, (Elder Richardson,) circulated the subscription, until he found that his expressed willingness to go with Mr. Allen & Co., "as far as truth and righteousness was concerned, and no farther," did not suit them.

That it was Mr. Allen who incorporated the "deep-laid plans" upon the original movement.

That it was he who planned, advised, and carried through, by active electioneering, the schismatic measures of his party in the First Church.

That it was between Mr. Allen and others on the one

part, and the Trustees (who afterward joined the Second Church,) on the other part; that a provisional bargain was made to make over property to a new Church for a subscription, worth not more than \$3,000 in cash, which they never offered to the First Church for less than \$4,000.

That this provisional agreement was made before the Church had voted to rescind the former resolution, (agreeing to pay \$4,000,) and to give permission to sell.

That when these votes were passed, Mr. Allen was in waiting at a house near by, and that the deeds, so hastily and clandestinely executed, were made out in his own handwriting.

That he counselled the dissolution of the First Church, and tried to get carriages to bring members in to vote for it.

That he was active in the measures by which the Church Records, decided by the above report to belong rightfully to the First Church, were kept out of their hands.

That on the next Sunday after the Sunday School was shut out of the Chapel, another School was organized, (by his effort and advice,) which took possession of the Library, Maps, &c., belonging to the excluded School, and retains them to this day.

Mr. Allen, in the *Gospel Herald* a few weeks after, and the letter of the Second Church to the Conference, reported this Library, Maps, &c., as belonging to the new Sunday School.

¶ A passing notice of a few of the false statements in this part of his book, will close what we have to say.

On p. 19, Mr. Allen says that Elder Craig's dedication sermon was "ill chosen," "and deeply wounded the feel-

ings of some." On the day that sermon was delivered Mr. Allen wrote to Mr. Maple eulogizing it in the highest terms.

On p. 27, he says of Mr. Fay, "If he starts for Mackinac to meet Mr. Mann."—Mr. Fay did *not* start for Mackinac; was never there; did not see Mr. Mann nor have a letter from him while he was absent; and did not expect to!

On page 32, in a pretended copy of a plan, he publishes the following:

"4th. That the pastor be at all times a minister of good standing in the Christian community."

"The reader will notice that the word 'church' is studiously avoided."

The only record of this 'plan'—the one from which Mr. Allen obtained his data—was seen at the time of the Committee's investigation. It is the original draft in the hand-writing of Judge Mills. In that paper stands plainly the word "church" and not "community." It was read "church," and so acted upon at the church meeting; when Mr. Allen was present. It was originally written "community," but that word was erased and "church" plainly substituted before it was reported. The paper which was, or ought to have been, before Mr. Allen's eyes shows for itself. "Falsifying records" is easy work for him.

His assertion, on p. 35, "J. B. Weston opposed the amendment and favored the article," can be proved false by unimpeachable witnesses who were present.

The language imputed to Mr. Weston, on p. 58, as addressed to Mr. Jewell, is misrepresented as to time, words and intention. It was spoken *before* the vote was taken, in relation to the men who "conceived" the plot


and not of those who "took part" in it. It had, at the time, only a suspected personal allusion. In the light of subsequent developments as to who "conceived" the plan of dissolving the Church, for what purpose and by what means, the public may judge if the remark was not vastly more *true* than *wise*.


Mr. Weston's positions in respect to the dissolution of the Church, taken, as Mr. Allen says, under "excitement," have been approved in cool deliberation by the Conference and its Committee.

The First Christian Church still lives, and holds the fellowship of the Conference, (which the Second Church has not yet received,) and designs, with the blessing of God to maintain the principles of the New Testament and of the Church Donomination.

Yellow Springs, O., June, 1859.

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100





LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 028 132 145 6

